

創価大学
国際仏教学高等研究所
年報

平成17年度
(第9号)

Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University
for the Academic Year 2005

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2006・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo • 2006

**The Central Asian Manuscript Collection of the
St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies
of the Russian Academy of Sciences***

Margarita I. VOROBYOVA-DESYATOVSKAYA
(translated from the Russian by Jan Nattier)

Manuscripts from East Turkestan, Dunhuang and Qara Qoto (northwestern China) began to appear in the Asiatic Museum of the Russian Academy of Sciences at the end of the 1880s. The final influx took place in 1915 as the result of two trips to East Turkestan by S. E. Malov. In 1930 all the manuscript collections of the Asiatic Museum were transferred to the just-established Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.

Since then more than seventy years have passed, and on the whole, the period of restoration and conservation of the manuscripts brought from Central Asia and China has come to an end. A complete count of the manuscripts has been produced and corresponding inventory descriptions composed; thanks to these, we can now say with complete certainty which individual collections are preserved and how many items they contain. It should be mentioned at the outset, however, that the majority of the collection consists not of entire works and complete manuscripts, but only of individual fragments. The other Central Asian collections in Europe and Asia are in a comparable state. Today it is considered a great honor to have fragments of Sanskrit, Tokharian, Khotanese, Uighur, and even Chinese manuscripts dating from the first millennium CE; in the entire world there is only a small number of such antiquities, and at present new discoveries are not expected. Of course, some individual finds have come to light, but as a rule these have not been newly excavated but rather were already preserved in various private collections in Europe,¹ Afghanistan, or Pakistan.

In the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s fragments of Sanskrit manuscripts and inscriptions on ceramic containers and other materials were found during the excavation of Buddhist complexes dating from the first to the eighth centuries CE in the territory of then-Soviet Central Asia: in Tadzhikistan, Turkmenistan, Kirgizia and Uzbekistan. After the break-up of the Soviet Union, the participation of Russian archaeologists in excavations in Central

* This paper originally appeared in a slightly different form in G. M. Bongard-Levin, M. I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, and E. M. Tyomkin, eds., *Pamyatniki indijskoi pis'mennosti iz Tsentral'noj Azii*, vol. 3 (Moscow: Nauka, Russian Academy of Sciences, 2004), pp. 75–88. The translator would like to thank Mr. Stefan BAUMS and Mr. Kenzō KAWASAKI for help on various technical points.

¹ For a report on the recent discovery of Sanskrit manuscripts owned by a Norwegian collector see Braarvig et al., 1999; the first publications of these manuscripts can be found in Braarvig 2000 and 2002.

Asia effectively came to a halt. Some monuments that had already been discovered were now in zones of armed conflict, and excavations there were discontinued (this applies above all to Termez and the Vaksh river valley of Tadzhikistan). One Sanskrit manuscript in Brāhmī script nonetheless came into the hands of scholars from St. Petersburg: this is the so-called “Merv manuscript,” which came to light in 1966, evidently when an ancient stūpa collapsed. This manuscript, written in Indian Brāhmī of the post-Kushan period, was in all probability copied in the territory of Kashmir; excerpts were recently published (Bongard-Levin et al. 2004: 273–336).

(1) The N. F. Petrovsky collection

At present 582 items are registered in the holdings of this collection, for whose study S. F. Oldenburg was principally responsible. Of these, 266 are Sanskrit manuscripts in Brāhmī script on paper (this figure includes manuscripts, individual folios of manuscripts, and fragments). Another 297 are Khotanese (= Khotan-Saka) manuscripts on paper, of which 59 manuscripts and fragments are Buddhist in content and 238 are economic documents, among them ten documents written on wood.² Another eleven fragments are in Tokharian.³ There are two documents on wood written in northwestern (Gāndhārī) Prakrit in the Kharoṣṭhī script, and one document on wood with two different scripts: Brāhmī on one side (in the Tokharian B language, = Kuchean) and Kharoṣṭhī (in the Gāndhārī language) on the other. Two documents on wood are written in Old Uighur, in the Uighur script. As far as Uighur specialists have been able to tell, these appear to be economic documents; they are unique in the sense that no other old Uighur manuscripts on wood have yet been found. There are three Tibetan manuscript fragments on paper, written in semi-cursive Tibetan script (the so-called “Dunhuang cursive”). The Sanskrit manuscripts in the Petrovsky collection will be surveyed below.

There are also 128 Islamic manuscripts acquired by N. F. Petrovsky, which comprise part of the Arabic-script manuscript collection in the St. Petersburg branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

In 1995 sixteen manuscripts copied in Khotan were returned to the Petrovsky holdings from the Chinese Dunhuang collection. Of these two can be considered bilingual Chinese-Khotanese texts, and the rest consist of a base text in Chinese together with an explanation in Khotanese written in Brāhmī script.⁴

(2) The N. N. Krotkov collection

Krotkov was the Russian consul in Urumchi and Qulja, and secretary of the consulate

² See Emmerick and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, eds., 1993 and 1995.

³ The honor of having published the first two Tokharian fragments, thus making them the property of world scholarship, belongs to S. F. Oldenburg (*ZVORAO* 1893, vol. 7, pp. 81–82+2 plates). At present these fragments are preserved, as the most esteemed pieces in the collection, under the numbers SI P/1a, 2a. It has been determined that they contain the text of the *Udānavarga*. Two fragments of a Sanskrit-Tokharian B dictionary (no. SI P/65b) were published by V. S. Vorobyov-Desyatovsky (1958); cf. note 18 below and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 1997, p. 208. Fragment SI P/141, a document on wood with text in Tokharian B on one side and northwest Prakrit in the Kharoṣṭhī script on the other, has been published; see Schmidt 2001.

⁴ See Kumamoto 2001.

in Girin (Jilin) and Tsitsikar. This collection contains 4,073 items, the majority of which are fragments written in Uighur cursive or semi-cursive script, dating from the 8th-10th centuries CE. The collection also contains fragments of early Uighur xylographs (9th-14th c.). Many of the Uighur manuscripts are written on the reverse of Chinese scrolls which were evidently copied in Kucha and Turfan. Other noteworthy pieces in the collection are 26 manuscript fragments in Sanskrit written in various types of North Turkestan Brāhmī,⁵ and nine manuscript fragments in Tokharian, of which five are in Tokharian B and four in Tokharian A.⁶ The collection also contains 31 Manichaean Sogdian fragments⁷ and two fragments in Syriac.⁸

(3) The M. M. Berezovsky collection

Berezovsky was a mathematician and biologist by training, and a member of the Russian Geographical Society, which organized an expedition to Kucha in 1906-07. The Berezovsky collection long remained unstudied; only in the year 2000 did restorationists complete the task of conserving the fragments in archival-quality Melinex (transparent polyester) film. Before that they had been enclosed in ordinary plastic film, and as a result of being kept there for a long time, they had disintegrated so badly that no work on them was possible. At present 136 items in the collection have been registered; they are manuscript fragments on paper. A distinctive feature of this collection is the association of the fragments with the names of the places where they were found. Among them are 59 fragments in Sanskrit. Some of these have been published,⁹ including one fragment of a didactic work in which the names of the heroes of the *Mahābhārata* are mentioned.¹⁰

Oldenburg had begun to prepare an edition of the eighteen Sanskrit fragments catalogued under the number SI B/18. In the archives is his transliteration of several fragments which he identified as belonging to the “Dīrghāgama-sūtra.” For the identification of these fragments he made use of the Pāli canon. We have not yet published these fragments, as it is now possible to identify them with greater precision. After the publication of the catalogue of Turfan manuscripts from German collections, it became necessary to collate our fragments not with the Pāli, but with the Sanskrit texts belonging to the canon of the Hinayāna schools that were prevalent in East Turkestan. It is known that the

⁵ Some of these have been published. See Bongard-Levin and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 1990, pp. 97-99 (two fragments of the *Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna*, SI Kr IV/343b, Kr IV/790), pp. 204-206 (one fragment of the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra*, SI 2 Kr/82[2]), and pp. 185-203 (two fragments of the *Nagaropama-sūtra*, SI 2 Kr/82[1] and 2 KT/9[2]).

⁶ See Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 1997, p. 208, n. 7.

⁷ See Ragoza 1980.

⁸ See Pigulevskaya 1940 and Meshcherskaya 1998.

⁹The first to be published were two fragments of syllabary tablets in slanting Central Asian Brāhmī from Onbashi Ming-öi in the region of Kucha; see Vorobyov-Desyatovsky 1958, Text 2. Twenty fragments of a *Prātimokṣa-sūtra* in the version of the Sarvāstivāda school (SI B/12) were published in Bongard-Levin and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 1990, vol. 2, pp. 185-203. In the same volume were published fragments of a *Mahāvadāna-sūtra* and of a Hinayāna *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* (SI B/14; pp. 208-244) and three fragments of the *Bodharājakuṁāra-sūtra* (SI B/14; Fragments II and III, pp. 245-249; see Hartmann 2004, especially p. 128, n. 30).

¹⁰ Bongard-Levin et al. 2004, pp. 261-263.

number and arrangement of sūtras in the Pāli and Sanskrit canons were different; sūtras that Oldenburg assigned to the *Dīrghāgama* belong to the *Sāriyuktāgama* in the Sanskrit canon. However, the German scholars did not publish the facsimiles and transliteration of their manuscripts from the Sanskrit Hinayāna canon, but only listed them in their catalogue. It was therefore decided to wait until we could compare our fragments with the German ones and be more specific on the identification of the texts.

Very recently four large fragments from different manuscripts on palm leaves (SI B/31) have been published.¹¹ They contain excerpts in Sanskrit from the canonical Abhidharma. These fragments are among the earliest of the manuscripts; based on paleographic analysis they can be dated to the Kushan era. One of the fragments seems to consist of folios from the same manuscript that is held in the German Turfan collection.

The Berezovsky collection also contains 74 manuscript fragments on paper in Tokharian B, in all probability Buddhist in content.¹² To this number we must also add 13 fragments of Tokharian documents which have been catalogued separately (SI B. Toch./1-13). Thus the overall number of Tokharian paper manuscript fragments is 87. The first publication of Tokharian B fragments from the Berezovsky collection was by N. D. Mironov, a student of Oldenburg, who published a bilingual text in Sanskrit and Tokharian B: one folio from the *Dharmapada*, now catalogued under the number SI B/117.¹³ One fragment from the *Udānavarga*, which at that time had not yet been catalogued, was given by Oldenburg to S. Lévi for publication;¹⁴ this fragment is now catalogued as SI B/16,4. Recently the St. Petersburg branch authorized the French scholar G.-J. Pinault to publish four documents from the Berezovsky collection.¹⁵

Berezovsky also brought back from Kucha 79 wooden tablets with text in the Tokharian B language. Many of them are in very poor condition, with the text eroded or obliterated. Historically it came about that these tablets were long kept in the Hermitage in the collection of A. S. Strelkov. They were transferred to the Institute of Oriental Studies only in April of 1935, and at present they are catalogued under the numbers Strel. 1-69 and Strel. 80-89.

(4) The S. F. Oldenburg collection

Here we will consider only the manuscripts brought back by Oldenburg from his first expedition to East Turkestan (1909-10). From the second expedition, which was dedicated to exploring the Buddhist complex at Dunhuang, Oldenburg brought back a huge collection of Chinese manuscripts and fragments of manuscripts dating from the 4th to the 11th centuries CE. At present they are kept in a different archive, that of the Dunhuang collection, which counts some 19,000 items in its holdings. All of the documents registered there were catalogued during the years 1956-1985.

¹¹ See Franco 2004, vol. 1, pp. 331-336 (folios 80 and 82). For ms. SI B/24,14 see Tyomkin 1996.

¹² Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 1997, p. 209.

¹³ See Mironov 1909-1910.

¹⁴ Lévi 1933.

¹⁵ These are document nos. SI B/9, 11, 12 and 13; see Pinault 1998.

The manuscripts brought back from the first expedition number 115 in all, most of them fragments. They include 18 Sanskrit manuscript fragments in the Brāhmī script; one in northwest Prakrit in the Kharoṣṭhī script; and three Uighur-Chinese manuscripts. Two of the latter contain fragments of paintings with the remains of an Old Uighur text. From this same expedition were brought back 11 fragments of Old Tibetan manuscripts, written in all probability at Dunhuang, in the local semi-cursive script. Two of these fragments belong to the famous book of divination (*mo*). One fragment in the Turkic Orkhon script also appeared among the items brought by this expedition. Other fragments are in Sogdian, in the Sogdian script. They have been published in the catalogue by A. N. Ragoza mentioned above (see note 7).

In addition to manuscripts, the expedition procured scraps of fabric, pieces of frescoes, and items of material culture, which at present are kept in the Hermitage, where they comprise a marvelous exhibit that has been an object of amazement for Chinese and West European scholars. The reason for this amazement is the fact that Oldenburg arrived in East Turkestan only after dozens of European expeditions had already been there, bringing back to museums in Europe the most valuable and extensive collections of manuscripts, works of art and items of material culture. The members of the Oldenburg expedition picked up whatever their predecessors had left behind: bits of manuscripts, pieces of fallen painted plaster, and fragments of sculptures. The wonderful exhibit is the result of the painstaking efforts of the restorationists and other staff members of the Hermitage.

Of the Indian manuscripts brought back by Oldenburg, thus far only one has been published: a phonetic table in upright Central Asian Brāhmī consisting of 11 folios, catalogued as SI O/20. In all probability they were written in Khotan, as indicated both by the separation of the *akṣaras* and by the fact that it contains an admonition in the Khotanese language: "Study, pupil, lest you feel my rod!" One fragment turned out to be in Khotanese: SI O/77, a piece of an economic document.¹⁶

The Oldenburg expedition also brought back 88 Islamic manuscripts, which are now included in the Arabic-script collection of the St. Petersburg branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies.

(5) The I. P. Lavrov collection

Lavrov was the secretary of the Russian consulate at Kashgar during the first decade of the 20th century. This collection has its own story. For a long time it was considered to contain only eight items, all of them Sanskrit manuscripts in Brāhmī script. Two of them were published: one folio from the *Saddharmaṇḍarīka-sūtra*,¹⁷ and one folio from the *Buddhanāma-sūtra*.¹⁸ The remainder of the manuscripts, still uncatalogued, were given to N. D. Mironov to work on in 1915-19. When Mironov emigrated from Russia in 1919, the manuscripts fell into the archive of the Cheka (the Soviet secret police) together with his documents. In 1930, via the Archive of the Academy of Sciences, they were put into

¹⁶ Fragments SI O/20 and SI O/77 have been published in the volumes of *Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum* mentioned above; cf. note 2.

¹⁷ See Bongard-Levin and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 1985, pp. 159-160.

¹⁸ Bongard-Levin and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, 1990, pp. 289-292.

the Orientalist Archive at the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Due to various circumstances, the Lavrov archive began to be worked on only in 1961. At that time the manuscripts were brought out from the archive and transferred to the Manuscripts section of the Institute. However, they were in a dreadful state, and it was practically impossible to work on them. Preliminary conservation work on the fragments was completed only in 1994. It turned out that there were another eight fragments, now catalogued as SI L/9-L/16.¹⁹ As soon as we were able to look through them, we were able to identify some of the fragments; all of these have now been published.²⁰

(6) The A. I. Kokhanovsky collection

Kokhanovsky worked as a doctor at the Russian consulate in Urumchi from 1906-08. In a letter written to S. F. Oldenburg on December 9, 1904, the ethnographer D. A. Klements, having arrived in East Turkestan in 1898 as one of the first Russians there,²¹ wrote: "Dr. Kokhanovsky, who is going to Urumchi, asked me if he could be of service to me in some scientific capacity. I proposed that he try to gather information on the antiquities of Turkestan and photograph and collect frescoes and manuscripts, because they'll disappear in any case. . . . In Turkestan there is enough work to last a hundred years, for all of Europe."²² Kokhanovsky took Klements' advice and brought several manuscripts back to St. Petersburg. Among them there was only one fragment of a Sanskrit manuscript, written in the Brāhmī script on paper. There was one fragment each in Tibetan and Mongolian, two in Uighur, 9 in Chinese, and 6 in Manichaean Sogdian, for a total of 20 items.

(7) Items brought by D. A. Klements

Klements himself also brought back from Turfan several fragments of Uighur xylographs, including an Old Uighur text transcribed in Brāhmī script. Of particular interest are two small fragments of a xylograph in the Brāhmī script on soft white paper, which comprises the earliest printed edition of a Sanskrit **Buddhist canon**, which can be dated to the 8th-9th century.²³ Within the collection of the St. Petersburg branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies is kept a special archive called "Frescoes, Stones and Slabs." The foundation for this collection was laid by Klements, who brought from Turfan fragments of plaster with inscriptions in Sanskrit written in North Turkestan Brāhmī and as well as Uighur inscriptions. Some of them were probably captions of frescoes; the rest are visitors' graffiti.

¹⁹ See Tyomkin 1995a and 1995b.

²⁰ See Bongard-Levin et al. 2004, pp. 247-260, 256-272, and 337-342.

²¹ On this expedition, sent by the Russian Academy of Sciences, see *Nachrichten über die von der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu St. Petersburg im Jahre 1898 ausgerüstete Expedition nach Turfan*, Vol. 1 (St. Petersburg), 1899.

²² Archives of the Russian Academy of Sciences, d. no. 269, p. 54.

²³ See Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 1980.

(8) The A. A. Dyakov collection

From 1908 to 1913 Dyakov worked (first on a temporary basis, then in a permanent capacity) as the secretary and consul in Qulja; from 1913 to 1915 he held the post of consul at Urumchi. At the site of Astana in the Turfan oasis he found, on August 15, 1908, a collection of manuscripts, which he immediately sent to the Russian Committee for the Study of Central and East Asia in St. Petersburg. At present this collection is kept at the St. Petersburg branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies. It consists of two manuscripts in all, which are of great rarity: One manuscript contains §§3-15 of a Manichaeian prayer of confession, and the other is a translation into Uighur from Chinese of the twenty-fifth chapter of the *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra*, which enjoyed tremendous popularity in Central Asia.

(9) The S. E. Malov collection

Funded by the Russian Committee for the Study of Central and East Asia and at the initiative of V. V. Radlov, Malov carried out two expeditions to East Turkestan, in 1909-11²⁴ and in 1913-15. But the Malov collection was finally restored and made available for scholarly study only in 1994. For a long time it had been considered that the collection contained only Uighur and Chinese manuscripts, as well as a collection of Tibetan documents on wood from Miran which had been brought back by Malov at the time of the second expedition. At the beginning of the 1990s, however, there came to light a box in the Manuscripts Department of the St. Petersburg branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies, that for a long time had not drawn attention. In it there turned out to be the non-Uighur part of the Malov collection; it had evidently been set aside by the Turkologists, who were first and foremost concerned with bringing the Old Uighur manuscripts under scholarly scrutiny. In 1983 there also appeared a package of manuscripts from the Malov archive, containing materials which he had apparently kept at home. As the result of these new discoveries, the Malov collection now contains the following Old Uighur manuscripts and fragments: (1) a group of Old Uighur manuscripts and xylographs, inventoried in 1953-54 by the Turkologist L. V. Dmitrieva and catalogued under the numbers SI M/1-SI M/7; (2) fragments of Old Uighur manuscripts and xylographs received from the Malov archive in 1983, mentioned by M. I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya as SI MA/1-MA/11. By our count there are a total of 18 items—manuscripts and fragments of manuscripts and xylographs—in the Old Uighur language.

As a result of the restoration work done at the beginning of the 1990s, 38 new items in Khotanese, comprising a total of 60 fragments, were restored. These have been published in *Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum* (see above, note 2). Among them are some unique fragments of the *Suvarṇabhāṣa-sūtra*. One economic document, written on paper, had accidentally been catalogued as M-1. This was detected before the discovery of the hidden box, and it is now included in the general collection under the number SI M/1 doc.

In the collection there also came to light Sanskrit manuscripts in the Brāhmī script,

²⁴ On the manuscripts brought by Malov see the Minutes of the Russian Committee, No. 5, 1911, 24 November, §53.

consisting of 8 items—SI M/16-M/19, M/21, M/23, M/24 and M/46—comprising 12 fragments in all.

There are also 12 Old Tibetan manuscript fragments, in the *pothi* style as well as scrolls, which on the basis of orthography ought to date from the 8th-11th centuries; these have not yet been restored.

In 1909-11 Malov gave to the Asiatic Museum 16 fragments of Chinese scrolls dating from the 5th-11th centuries. It is not known exactly where they were found, but in light of their close resemblance to the Chinese manuscripts from Dunhuang they were included in the Dunhuang collection.

As the result of the restoration and investigative research carried out in recent years, the Malov collection has increased significantly, and it now contains not 7 items, but 53: SI M/I-M/53.²⁵

New data on the Sanskrit manuscripts in the N. F. Petrovsky collection

After the publication of *Indian Texts from Central Asia* by G. M. Bongard-Levin and M. I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya in 1986, work on the Sanskrit manuscripts by its authors continued, and as a result a card catalogue of the N. F. Petrovsky collection was finally completed. For an appraisal of the collection we adopted the statistical method set forth by Jens-Uwe Hartmann and Klaus Wille in their work on the Hoernle collection. This approach also allows us to draw several general conclusions about the character of the Buddhist literature that was popular in the southern oasis towns of East Turkestan during the second half of the first millennium CE.

To characterize our collection from the point of view of paleography, we should first mention that only ten manuscripts (one of which consists of 16 fragments, and the remainder of one fragment each) are written in variants of North Turkestan (or “slanting” in the older terminology) Brāhmī. In all the rest, variants of South Turkestan (or “upright”) Brāhmī are used. The writing of many of our manuscripts exhibits a similarity to the Gilgit varieties of Brāhmī. Only a few fragments of small size, for which palm leaves or birchbark were used for copying, are written in Kushan Brāhmī or early variants of post-Kushan Brāhmī. The great majority of the Petrovsky collection now consists of jumbled palm-leaf manuscript fragments.

Let us now turn to the content of the manuscripts. It seems quite evident that in the Buddhism of the second half of the first millennium significant changes had begun to take place, above all the appearance of the Vajrayāna. In Vajrayāna texts we can perceive two substrata: local folk beliefs and cults, and brahmanical and pre-brahmanical protective charms of Indian origin. A significant proportion of the texts in the Petrovsky collection are *dhāraṇīs*—spells and mantras. We identified 34 different exemplars, comprising up to 200 fragments, which contain various types of spells. Thus, about 13% of our manuscripts are connected with the Vajrayāna. Among these fragments the majority belong to the sūtra *Pañcarakṣa*, the “Five Protections.” These reflect the cult of five tantric mother-goddesses, each one of whom personifies a particular set of magical formulas. These

²⁵ See Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 1995a. Four Sanskrit fragments and one Tibetan document on paper are published in this article.

formulas are to be used to summon the goddesses for help. In our collection there are three groups of magical formulas: those directed to Mahāmāyūrīvidyārājñī “Great Peacock, Queen of Spells,” in four exemplars (SI P/30, 38, 39, 58+59), to Mahāsahasrapramardinī-vidyārājñī, in five (SI P/32, 54+56(1), 44a, 44b and 64), and to Mahāpratisarāvidyārājñī, in four (SI P/40, 41f, 41b, 42). Appeals to these three goddesses occupy a total of 13 different exemplars comprising more than 100 fragments, thus constituting about 5% of all the Sanskrit manuscripts in the collection. It must of course be mentioned that a large collection of analogous texts was found at Gilgit, but here the incantations are addressed above all to Mahāpratisarā.²⁶ Fragments of the *Mahā-māyūrīvidyārājñī* were also found among the famous manuscripts of Lieutenant G. Bower, discovered in Kucha in 1890 and edited by R. Hoernle in 1893.²⁷ The *Mahāpratisarāvidyārājñī* and *Mahāsahasrapramardinīvidyārājñī* are also found in the German Turfan collection (see Catalogue nos. 983, 1008 and 1011).

With this group of sūtras are also connected texts containing a conversation between the Buddha and the *yakṣa* general Maṇibhadra (SI P/28, SI P/32, SI P/37), with 25 fragments in all, the majority of them edited by S. F. Oldenburg (cf. above). Their conversation concerns the problem of the protection of monks and other living beings from the harm caused by *yakṣas*. It is interesting that one of the texts on the conversation between the Buddha and Maṇibhadra belongs to the literary category of the *Prajñāpāramitā*. It was edited by G. M. Bongard-Levin together with Japanese, German, and American scholars as co-authors.²⁸

Texts of the “Five Protections” in Central Asia, Tibet, China, and the Tangut kingdom of Xi Xia were translated into local languages. But based on the quantity of the translations that have come down to us, we may infer that in the Chinese cultural sphere they did not enjoy great popularity, while in Tibet and in the Tangut kingdom a great number of exemplars of this work have been preserved. These texts were especially influential in Tibet, which departed from the Mahāyāna and adopted Tantra at a comparatively early date. The sūtras of the “Five Protections” are among the best represented compositions in the Tibetan collection of the St. Petersburg branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies, preserved in both manuscripts and xylographs.

As to other texts containing spells, the following compositions are contained in the Petrovsky collection:

1) The *Sumukhanāma-dhāraṇī* in four copies (22 folios and fragments). Two manuscripts—SI P/65a and SI P/77 (six folios)—have been published.²⁹ Two other manuscripts—SI P/18 (6 folios) and P/75 (7 folios) have not yet been edited. Unfortunately they are poorly preserved, but they should nonetheless be published in order to make available all the texts that have been found. Not long ago Klaus Wille discovered three fragments of this dhāraṇī in the Hoernle collection, and he was able to match them with

²⁶ See von Hinüber 1979, fragment nos. 6, 14, 15 and 17.

²⁷ See Hoernle 1893, pp. 222-240e.

²⁸ Bongard-Levin et al., 1996, pp. 67-81; Bongard-Levin 1994.

²⁹ See Bongard-Levin, Tyomkin, and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 1967; Bongard-Levin and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, 1981; Bongard-Levin and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, 1986; and Bongard-Levin and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, 1994.

fragments from the Crosby collection.³⁰ Taking into account all the extant/preserved folios and fragments of this *dhāraṇī* and comparing them with the complete Khotanese texts, we can conclude that we have in hand approximately half of the Sanskrit text. Differences between the Khotanese and our unpublished fragments P/18 and P/75 allow us to determine that they represent a different and shorter variant of this text, which differs from the fuller text contained in manuscript P/77, not only in different readings of the *dhāraṇīs* but also in that it has a shorter prose text. In manuscript P/77 there were originally 18 folios (the last folio, containing the colophon, has been preserved). In manuscript P/18 the folios are only half as large, yet it originally consisted of just 23 folios (the penultimate folio, i.e., page 22, has been preserved). Through our joint efforts, we can determine whether there really existed two versions of this *dhāraṇī*.

2) The *Buddhanāma-sūtra* also belongs to those texts that have spells as their basis. In the Petrovsky collection there are a total of five exemplars of this sūtra,³¹ comprising some 30 folios and fragments altogether. Three of them have been studied by Oskar von Hinüber.³² Two new pieces were published by G. M. Bongard-Levin and this writer,³³ and Klaus Wille recently published three new fragments from the Hoernle and Godfrey collections.³⁴ However, this total comprises only an insignificant portion of a sūtra of the *Buddhanāma* type, as the numerous Chinese texts found at Dunhuang attest. In particular, in the Dunhuang manuscript collection at the St. Petersburg branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies there are three different compositions of the “*Buddhanāma*” type, including some with colored illustrations. In the Hermitage there is also a Tangut text of a *Buddhanāma-sūtra* with colored illustrations.

3) Finally, in the Petrovsky collection there is a certain quantity of unidentified *dhāraṇīs*, comprising 12 exemplars totaling about 25 folios.³⁵ Part of them have been published by Oldenburg (cf. above, 6. SI P/26-2); the rest remain unpublished.

Thus *dhāraṇīs* comprise the most significant part of the Petrovsky collection, testifying to the popularity of these texts in the southern oasis towns of East Turkestan in the second half of the first millennium CE.

In second place, in terms of the number of folios and fragments, is the *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra* or *Lotus Sūtra*; in our collection there are 27 different exemplars,³⁶ of which 10 have been published.³⁷ In numerical terms fragments of this

³⁰ Wille 1996.

³¹ Catalogue numbers SI P/60, 61, 70, 71a+116e+116sh; L/2.

³² See von Hinüber 1987-1989.

³³ Bongard-Levin and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 1990, pp. 277-292.

³⁴ See Wille 1999.

³⁵ Catalogue numbers SI P/22, 23, 26, 29, 55+56(2), 71b, 72g, 110, 112, 113 (3 fragments), 116b (3 fragments) + 116c (1 fragment), 116i.

³⁶ Their catalogue numbers are SI P/5, 8, 9, 11, 11(1) + 7, 12 + 13, 10, 20(4), 62(1), 62(10), 62(12), 67(2), 67(3), 67(4), 68, 74 + 67(8), 72b, 76, 79, 82b, 83a, 83b, 90b(!), 118a, 121c, 151.

³⁷ In a recent monograph Klaus Wille has published a group of fragments of the *Lotus Sūtra* contained in the Petrovsky collection (Wille 2000; the pieces from the Petrovsky collection are published on pp. 161-162). Unfortunately this group turns out to be incomplete, since Wille was not able to make

sūtra comprise about 10% of the entire Petrovsky collection. Among them are represented both versions of the sūtra known at the present time: the so-called “Central Asian” and “Nepalese-Gilgit” recensions. Fragments of the Central Asian version clearly predominate: It is sufficient to point out that this collection contains the most extensive and well known exemplar of all these manuscripts—SI P/5. This copy contained some 500 folios, of which 399 are in our collection, and of these, 324 are continuously paginated. In other depositories elsewhere in the world, a total of 56 folios belonging to the same manuscript have been found. This means that just 12 folios of the sūtra have not yet been located. Paleographic analysis, as well as the surviving colophons in the manuscripts and fragments themselves, show that the *Lotus Sūtra* enjoyed the greatest popularity in the southern oases of East Turkestan. In the German Turfan collection, which comes mainly from the northern oases, thus far only one fragment of it has been found (catalogue no. 622). In other German collections there are about ten fragments, but these too come from the southern oases.³⁸

Among the manuscripts discovered at Gilgit fragments of the *Lotus Sūtra* occupy one of the first places, if not the very first place.³⁹ A certain number of unpublished fragments from the A. Francke collection were found fairly recently in a basement in Munich, where they had been kept in sealed boxes throughout World War II. A report on this collection has been published by R. E. Emmerick.⁴⁰ We must also mention the special popularity of the *Lotus Sūtra* in Khotan, where sections of the text were commissioned by Khotanese donors. Of this we have the testimony of colophons as well as postscripts in Khotanese appended to the Sanskrit sections, such as the Kashgar Petrovsky manuscript SI P/5 (with a large concluding colophon and three postscripts at the end of three chapters), as well as two postscripts appended at the bottom of mss. SI P/7 and SI P/10. The absence of a Khotanese translation of the full text of this sūtra can easily be understood in light of the colophon to chapter 23 of the Khotanese manuscript known as *The Book of Zambasta*, also called “Saka manuscript E” by scholars (Petrovsky collection, SI P/6). In this colophon the author of the Khotanese text complains that the local population was unwilling to recognize the sacredness of a text if it was written not in Sanskrit, but in their mother tongue.⁴¹

In the Chinese Dunhuang collection of the St. Petersburg branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies, the *Lotus Sūtra* stands in second place, in terms of the number of manuscripts, after the *Vajracchedikāsūtra*. In the 7th century the 25th chapter of the *Lotus Sūtra*—entitled “Samantamukha”—began to circulate as an independent work, and the cult of the bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara became especially popular due to the protective *dhāranīs* contained in this chapter. We can make this judgement with full confidence use of the latest publication by this writer, which appeared only in 2004 (see Bongard-Levin et al., pp. 256–260). Wille’s work also includes a very useful table, “Concordances: Kashgar MS — Other Central Asian MSS” (see pp. 168–183), in which he was able to register page by page all of the pieces of the *Lotus Sūtra* found to date.

³⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 159.

³⁹ See von Hinüber 1979, nos. 44, 45, and 47–50.

⁴⁰ See Emmerick 1984.

⁴¹ See Emmerick 1968, p. 343.

thanks to the presence in our collection of a large quantity of “pocket books” in which the text of the 25th chapter was copied, evidently for daily use. These booklets date from the 8th-9th centuries. The tradition is still alive today: some followers of the *Lotus Sūtra* in Japan also use such booklets, but in these it is the 2nd and 16th chapters of the sūtra that are printed. Manuscripts from the St. Petersburg branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies contain examples of the translation of the *Lotus Sūtra* into seven Central and East Asian languages. In the Tangut state of Xi Xia in the 10th-12th centuries, the sutra and its 25th chapter were evidently as popular as they were in Dunhuang.

In third place in terms of quantity of fragments in the Petrovsky collection is the *Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*: we have excerpts from 24 different manuscripts of this sūtra, comprising nearly 9% of the entire collection.⁴² Although previously we had said that among our fragments the majority belong to the *Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā*, or *The Prajñāpāramitā in 8,000 Lines*, investigations in recent years, in which G. M. Bongard-Levin and our Japanese and German colleagues took part, have shown that our fragments for the most part belong to the tradition of another variant of the sūtra, the *Prajñāpāramitā in 25,000 Lines*. WATANABE Shōgo has stated that the majority of the fragments in the Petrovsky collection “are variant texts deriving from the same source. We could therefore assume the existence of an Urtext of both the *Aṣṭadaśa-sāhasrikā* and the *Pañcavimśatisāhasrikā*.⁴³ Bongard-Levin, writing in cooperation with Japanese and German scholars, has published four *Prajñāpāramitā* fragments. They have demonstrated that, compared to the earliest Chinese version (Taishō Tripitaka no. 221), the text of one of the published fragments (SI P/19[1]) belongs to a more ancient (and slightly more extensive) version than the early Chinese translation.⁴⁴ An analogous Sanskrit text was found at Gilgit; it differs from the *Prajñāpāramitā in 8,000 Lines* and is noticeably closer to the *Prajñāpāramitā in 25,000 Lines*.

In addition, the study of fragment SI P/19(1) in tandem with the early Chinese translations of the *Prajñāpāramitā* and fragments in other collections, especially the collection from Khotan, has allowed scholars to demonstrate the interrelationship between the *Abhisamayālāmikāra* and the text of the *Pañcavimśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* that was redacted based on it in the first millennium CE and to isolate the archetype in the appearance of early *mātrikās*.

Having thus distinguished these three groups of manuscripts which together constitute more than 30% of the Petrovsky collection, we can infer that three major schools of Buddhism had spread through the southern oasis towns of East Turkestan during the second half of the first millennium CE: the Vajrayāna, the Mahāyāna school of the *Lotus Sūtra*, and the Mahāyāna school of the *Prajñāpāramitā*. The latter, it would seem, had a tendency in this period to close association with the Vajrayāna. As shown by the numerical superiority of such texts in our collection, both in Sanskrit and in other

⁴² Catalogue numbers SI P/19, 20(5), 46a, 62b, g, e, k, v; 67(7), 67(13), 67(14), 72a, 72b, 82a, 83m, n, z; 84a, b, g, d, v; 116o (5 fragments), 123i (6 fragments), 123k, 145, 146 (2 fragments); 147a, 147 + 148. See Bongard-Levin 1988-1989, Bongard-Levin and Watanabe 1997, Bongard-Levin and Kimura 1995, and Bongard-Levin and Hori 1996.

⁴³ Watanabe 1994, p. 386.

⁴⁴ Cf. Watanabe 1994, p. 35.

languages, it was not extensive texts such as *The Prajñāpāramitā in 8,000 Lines* or *The Prajñāpāramitā in 25,000 Lines* that enjoyed greatest popularity, but the so-called “short” texts of the Prajñāpāramitā category, the majority of which included *dhāraṇīs* in their content. This applies above all to the *Vajracchedikā*, which has the largest number of copies in the Dunhuang collection of the Institute of Oriental Studies in St. Petersburg. This sūtra, like the 25th chapter of the *Lotus Sūtra*, was copied into pocket-size booklets, divided into sections (which are not in the canonical version), and prefaced by opening *stotras* extolling the possibility of receiving protection and aid, thanks to the fact that various deities esteem the sūtra and promised to help living beings. All these processes took place with the *Vajracchedikā* in Central Asia, as much as in the territory of China itself, in the capital, where canonical versions of the sūtras were disseminated. These same processes also took place with another sūtra of the “short texts” category, the *Hṛdayasūtra*. In Dunhuang a particular local version was circulated, based on a translation of the sūtra into Tibetan and Tangut. Still another sūtra—the *Kauśika-sūtra*—has been preserved only in Central Asia. Its text is known in manuscripts in Sanskrit, Khotanese, and Tibetan. A great number of Tibetan manuscripts of this sūtra from the 14th century were brought from Qara-Qoto by P. K. Kozlov.

Comparing this set of texts with those discovered at Gilgit, and with the collection of manuscripts from the northern oases of Turfan and Kucha now in the German collections, we can clearly see the differences, evidently connected with basic trends in Buddhism that had taken root in these regions during the period under consideration. In the northern oasis towns it is mainly the Hīnayāna that is represented; thus the basis of the German Turfan collection consists of sūtras from the four *āgamas*. The predominant school clearly was the Sarvāstivāda. In the southern oases of East Turkestan, by contrast—i.e., in Khotan and Kashgar—the literature of the Vajrayāna and the Mahāyāna predominated. Gilgit, of course, occupied a middle position between India and East Turkestan. If in the northern oases there were found manuscripts of the Vinaya belonging to the Sarvāstivāda school, at Gilgit there was discovered a whole collection of texts of the Mūlasarvāstivadins. And presumably it was this school that held the leading position in Buddhism on Indian territory. This is attested by the translation of their Vinaya into Tibetan carried out in the 9th century by Indian *panditas* and Tibetan *lotsawas*. The Tibetan Tripitaka includes only the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādins. In Gilgit Vajrayāna manuscripts were also found (the sūtra on the “Five Protections”; see above), as well as Mahāyāna sūtras. By its repertoire of Buddhist literature one can posit links between Gilgit and Nālanda.

An exception to the tendencies described above is the Hīnayāna sūtra *Nagaropama*, fragments of which are found in the Petrovsky collection (SI P/33). We have already mentioned these fragments, when we referred to the publication of manuscripts relating the conversation of the Buddha with the *yakṣa* general Maṇibhadra.⁴⁵ The first finds of fragments from this manuscript took place in 1896, when a manuscript was acquired at Kashgar by George McCartney and sent to Hoernle, who published it in 1897.⁴⁶ Subsequently Hoernle succeeded in locating folios from the very same manuscript in the Weber collection. A third find was made by Petrovsky. An entire collective of authors,

⁴⁵ See Bongard-Levin and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 2004, p. 52, n. 112.

⁴⁶ See Hoernle 1897.

consisting of Russian, German, Japanese, and American scholars, brought all the folios that had been found into one manuscript and obtained not only the full text of the sūtra, but also a preface. Three folios of the manuscript from the Petrovsky collection comprise the end of the canonical portion of the sūtra, after which follows the afterword: a conversation between the Buddha and the brahman Sanatkumāra, in which the brahman relates to the Buddha the names of *rākṣasas* and other evil spirits, who esteem the *Nagaropama-sūtra* and promise to protect living beings. This unique postscript is not found in the two other manuscripts. Paleography shows that the manuscript was written in Kucha. The afterword contains spells, and for this reason the text long remained unidentified.

As to the remaining manuscripts in the Petrovsky collection, among them are Buddhist sūtras and other texts, which are important for the study of the Buddhist canon: they show how the editing of Buddhist texts in East Turkestan took place, in what periods of time and in what cultural setting.

It is noteworthy that among the Petrovsky manuscripts there is not a single fragment of the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra*, a basic Vinaya text. There are only an insignificant number of excerpts from commentarial texts, such as manuscript fragments on birchbark that are evidently from the *Vinayavastu* (SI P/16 + P/17), or two folios from an unidentified manuscript (SI P/20(1) + P/20(2), folio nos. 42 and 46) of which the colophon is preserved: *vaiyyāpatyakara parivartah caturtha*. In the text the Buddha rules on various disciplinary issues with Kāśyapa, who had arrived in the company of 500 monks.

Of particular interest are two nearly complete *avadāna* texts: the *Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna* (catalogued as SI P/15, 22 folios) and the *Ajitasenavyākaraṇa* (SI P/63, 24 folios). These are the same texts for which Oldenburg established two numbers—13 and 14—and about which he repeatedly mentioned the necessity of publication, offering excerpts from the *Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna* and comparing our manuscript with the folios from the Weber collection published by Hoernle.⁴⁷ Both *avadānas* have now been published.⁴⁸ An analogous manuscript of the *Ajitasenavyākaraṇa* was found at Gilgit. A comparison of our text with the one from Gilgit showed interesting results. Although there are minor/insignificant differences in the texts, which could have come about as the result of the work of editors, in both cases the copyists made use of one and the same original and repeated its errors. These errors are both in the prose portion and in the *gāthās*. The editors of the Gilgit manuscript tried to correct these errors, retaining the original text only in interlinear notes. It seems that it would have been better to do the reverse, putting their improvements in the notes. For example, the Gilgit Sanskrit text (p. 105, *gāthā 1*) reads: *yadā tvam pravisasi pindapātika vimocaye tvam bahavam hi pāṇinām*, “when you come [into the city] for alms, you liberate [thereby] many living beings.” But the editors of the Gilgit manuscript corrected the text in accordance with Sanskrit grammar: *yadā tvayā pravisati pindapātiko vimocaye yam bahavohi prāṇinām*. A comparison of this redaction of the *gāthās* with our manuscript affirms that the two copyists had before them one and the same original (or copied from one another?).

Among Mahāyāna sūtras it is appropriate to draw special attention to two: the

⁴⁷ See Oldenburg 1894, pp. 66–67 and 1900, pp. 31–32.

⁴⁸ See Bongard-Levin and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 1990, pp. 39–184.

Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra, 6 fragments of which have been published by Bongard-Levin,⁴⁹ and the *Kāśyapaparivarta*, attested in one manuscript (SI P/2, 81 folios, containing the complete text) and two fragments (SI P/85a and 85b).⁵⁰ This sūtra is of unique importance for the history of the formation of the Mahāyāna Buddhist canon, of which a Sanskrit version never fully came into being, and for the study of two key ideas of Buddhist philosophy: *madhyamā pratipad* “the middle way” and *śūnyatā*, literally “voidness” or “non-subjectivity and non-objectivity.” On the interpretation of these terms in the two most important Buddhist philosophical schools—the Mādhyamika and the Yogācāra—hinges the overall evaluation of their significance in the history of Indian philosophy. The sūtra also contains an early codification of the moral code of the bodhisattva. The *Kāśyapaparivarta* was apparently known as the *Ratnakūṭa* (“Heap of Treasures”) on the cusp of the first century CE; afterwards this became the name for the entire collection of 49 sūtras. A critical edition of the *Kāśyapaparivarta*, together with facsimiles of the text, has now been published.⁵¹

We will not pause to consider here those sūtras that are attested only in single fragments. We will mention only that not all the manuscripts and fragments have been identified. Such items total 23, i.e., around 8% of the collection. It is possible that some of them may yet be identified. For example, in one of the fragments, when the relation between the Buddha and Māra is discussed, the son of Māra is called Jāyapati. As it happens, this topic can also be found in one of the *avadānas*. In another folio of the manuscript (SI P/80) we find a text whose content resembles that of a fragment from the German Turfan collection (no. 1340): *āyuṣmān Aniruda (!) śrāvastyāṁ viharati sma*. The Turfan text has likewise not been identified. The *gāthās* on the leaf SI P/115 are similar to a Turfan text identified as the “Brahman Nilabhūti stotra” (no. 1764).

Taking into account the fact that many manuscripts have simply not come down to us, and that our conclusions concerning the most salient trends in the development of Buddhism in the northern and southern oases of East Turkestan should therefore be considered somewhat provisional and preliminary, we nonetheless consider that our identification of three major trends in the Buddhism of the southern oases (the Vajrayāna, that of the followers of the *Lotus Sūtra*, and that of followers of the *Prajñāpāramitā*), based on the manuscripts that appear in the Petrovsky collection, is substantially correct.

⁴⁹ Catalogue nos. SI P/88a, 88b, 88c, 88d, 88v, 89. See Bongard-Levin and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 1985, pp. 37–64 and Bongard-Levin 1986.

⁵⁰ See Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 1995b.

⁵¹ Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 2002; cf. Bongard-Levin et al. 2004, pp. 89–208.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bongard-Levin, G. M., 1986. *Sanskrit Fragments of the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- _____, 1988-1989. "A Fragment of the *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā* from Central Asia. In A. Kumar et al., eds., *Studies in Indology: Prof. Rasik Vibari Joshi Felicitation Volume* (New Delhi: Shree Publishing House), pp. 39-42.
- _____, 1994. "A Fragment of the *Pañcaviniśatisahasrikā Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* from East Turkestan." In *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 114, no. 3, pp. 383-385.
- Bongard-Levin, G. M., Daniel J. Boucher, Takamichi Fukita, and Klaus Wille, 1996. "The *Nagaropamasūtra*: An Apotropaic Text from the *Sat�uktāgama*. A Transliteration, Reconstruction, and Translation of the Central Asian Sanskrit Manuscripts." In *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden*, Beiheft 6 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), pp. 8-131.
- Bongard-Levin, G. M., and Shin'ichiro Hori, 1996. "A Fragment of the Larger *Prajñāpāramitā* from Central Asia." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 19-60.
- Bongard-Levin, G. M., and Takayasu Kimura, 1995. "New Fragments of the *Pañcaviniśatisahasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* from Eastern Turkestan." *East and West*, vol. 45, pp. 355-358.
- Bongard-Levin, G. M., E. N. Tyomkin, and M. I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, 1967. "A Fragment of the Sanskrit *Sumukhadhāraṇī*." *Indo-Iranian Journal* vol. 10, nos. 2-3, pp. 150-159.
- Bongard-Levin, G. M., and M. I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, 1981. "A New Fragment of the Sanskrit *Sumukhadhāraṇī* and its Saka Version." *Indologica Taurinensia*, vol. 8-9, pp. 45-49.
- _____, 1984a. "Novye sanskritskie teksty iz Vostochnogo Turkestana (fragmenty *Prātimokṣa-sūtra* sarvastivadinov). *Vestnik drevnej istorii*, No. 4, pp. 56-76.
- _____, 1984b. "Unknown Dhāraṇis from Eastern Turkestan (*Buddhanāma-sūtra*). " In S. D. Joshi, ed., *Amṛtadharma: Professor R.N. Dandekar Felicitation Volume* (Delhi: Ajanta Publications), pp. 485-492.
- _____, 1985. *Pamyatniki indiiskoi pis'mennosti iz Tsentral'nõi Azii: Izdanie tekstov, issledovanie, perevod i kommentarii*. Vol. 1. Moscow: Nauka, Russian Academy of Sciences.
- _____, 1985b. "Indian Texts from Central Asia (*Buddhanāma-sūtra*). Serie Orientale Roma, vol. LVI, no. 1 (*Orientalia Josephi Tucci Memoriale Dedicata*), pp. 159-174.
- _____, 1986. *Indian Texts from Central Asia*. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- _____, 1986b. "Fragmenty sanskritskoi 'Sumukkha-dkharani.' " *Peredneaziatskiy sbornik VI. Drevnyaya i srednevekovaya istoriya i filologiya stran Perednego i Srednego Vostoka*, pp. 156-159.
- _____, 1990. *Pamyatniki indiiskoi pis'mennosti iz Tsentral'nõi Azii: Izdanie tekstov, issledovanie, perevod i kommentarii*. Vol. 2. Moscow: Nauka, Russian Academy of Sciences.
- _____, 1994. "Novyi fragment sanskritskoj 'Sumukkhanamadkharani.' " *Vostochnoe istoricheskoe vostokovedenie i spetsial'nye istoricheskie discipliny* (Moscow: Nauka), pp. 43-47.
- Bongard-Levin, G. M., M. I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, and E. M. Tyomkin, 2004. *Pamyatniki indiiskoi pis'mennosti iz Tsentral'nõi Azii: Izdanie tekstov, issledovanie, perevod i kommentarii*. Vol. 3. Moscow: Nauka, Russian Academy of Sciences..
- Bongard-Levin, G. M., and Shōgo Watanabe, 1997. "A Fragment of the Sanskrit Text of the *Śilapāramitā*." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens und Archiv für indische Philosophie*, vol. 41, pp. 93-98.
- Braarvig, Jens, ed., 2000. *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection*, I: *Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. 1. Oslo: Hermes Publishing.
- _____, 2002. *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection*, III: *Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. 2. Oslo: Hermes Publishing.
- Braarvig, Jens, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Kazunobu Matsuda and Lore Sander, 1999. "Reports from the Kyoto Seminar for the Buddhist Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection, May 10-14, 1999," *Bukkyō daigaku sōgōkenkyūjohō* 佛教学総合研究所報, no. 17, pp. 10-15.
- Emmerick, Ronald, ed. and trans., 1968. *The Book of Zambasta: A Khotanese Poem on Buddhism*. London: Oxford University Press.

- _____, 1984. "Newly-discovered Buddhist Texts from Khotan." In *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Congress of Human Sciences in Asia and North Africa, Tokyo-Kyoto, 31st August-7th September 1983* (Tokyo), I, pp. 219-220.
- Emmerick, Ronald, and Margarita I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, eds., 1993. *Saka Documents. Vol. VII: The St. Petersburg Collections.* Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum. London: British Library.
- _____, eds., 1995. *Saka Documents Text. Vol. III: The St. Petersburg Collections.* London: British Library.
- Franco, Eli, 2004. *The Spitzer Manuscript: The Oldest Philosophical Manuscript in Sanskrit.* Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe, 2004. "Contents and Structure of the *Dīrghāgama* of the (Mūla)Sarvāstivādins. *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2003*, vol. VII, pp. 119-137.
- von Hinüber, Oskar, 1979. *Die Erforschung der Gilgit-Handschriften.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- _____, 1987-1989. "Dhāraṇīs aus Zentralasien." *Indologica Taurinensia*, vol. 14, pp. 231-249.
- Hoernle, A. F. Rudolf, 1893. *The Bower Manuscript: Facsimile leaves, nagari transcript, romanized transliteration, and English translation with notes.* Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing.
- _____, 1897. "Three Further Collections of Ancient Manuscripts." *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, LXVI, part 1, no. 4, pp. 237-244.
- Kumamoto, Hiroshi, 2001. "Sino-Hvatanica Peterburgensis, Part I." In *Manuscripta Orientalia* (St. Petersburg), vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 3-9.
- Lévi, Sylvain, 1933. *Fragments de textes koutchéens: Udānavarga, Udānastotra, Udānālamkāra et Karmavibhaṅga.* Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Meshcherskaya, E. N., 1998. "Fragmenty siriškoj rukopisi sobraniya Instituta Vostokovedeniya RAN." *Pravoslavnij Palestinskij Sbornik*, vol. 98 (35), pp. 148-158.
- Mironov, N. D., 1909-1910. "Iz rukopisnykh materialov ekspeditsii Berezovskogo v Kuchu." *Mélanges Asiatiques* (Russian Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg), vol. 14, pp. 97-112.
- Oldenburg, S. F., 1894. "Otryvki kashgarskikh sanskrtskikh rukopisei iz sobraniya N. F. Petrovskogo, I." *Zapiski vostochnogo otdeleniya russkogo arkheologicheskogo obshchestva*, vol. 8, pp. 47-67 + two tables.
- _____, 1897a. "Otzyv o sobraniii kashgarskikh rukopisei N. F. Petrovskogo." Minutes of the sessions of the Historical-Philological Department of the Imperial Academy of Sciences for 1897, No. VIII of May 7, Appendix III.
- _____, 1897b. *Predvaritel'naya zamečka o buddijskoj rukopisi, napisannoj pi's'mom Kkharoshtki.* St. Petersburg.
- _____, 1899. "Otryvki kashgarskikh sanskrtskikh rukopisei iz sobraniya N. F. Petrovskogo, II." *Zapiski vostochnogo otdeleniya russkogo arkheologicheskogo obshchestva*, vol. 11, pp. 207-264 + two tables.
- _____, 1900. [Untitled review of the publications of the Central Asian Manuscripts by R. Hoernle found in the British Museum.] *Zapiski vostochnogo otdeleniya russkogo arkheologicheskogo obshchestva*, vol. 12, pp. 28-36.
- _____, 1902-1903. "Otryvki kashgarskikh sanskrtskikh rukopisei iz sobraniya N. F. Petrovskogo, III." *Zapiski vostochnogo otdeleniya russkogo arkheologicheskogo obshchestva*, vol. 15, pp. 113-122 + three tables.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean, 1998. "Economic and Administrative Documents in Tocharian B from the Berezovsky and Petrovsky Collections." *Manuscripta Orientalia* (St. Petersburg-Helsinki), vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 3-20.
- Pugulevskaya, N. V., 1940. "Sirijskij i siro-tyurkskij fragmenty iz Khara-khoto i Turfana." *Sovetskoe vostokovedenie*, vol. 1, pp. 212-234.
- Ragoza, F. N., 1980. *Sogdijskie fragmenty tsentral'noaziatskogo sobraniya Instituta vostokovedeniya. Faksimile. Izdanie tekstov, chtenie, perevod.* Moscow: Nauka.
- Schmidt, Klaus T., 2001. "Entzifferung verschollener Schriften und Sprachen. dargestellt am Beispiel der Kučā-Kharosthi Typ B und des Kučā-Prakrits." *Göttinger Beiträge zur Asiensforschung*,

- Heft 1 (Göttingen: Peust & Gutschmidt Verlag), pp. 7-35.
- Tyomkin, E. N., 1995a. "Unique Sanskrit Fragments of the *Sūtra of Golden Light* from the P. I. Lavrov Collection," *Manuscripta Orientalia*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 29-35.
- _____, 1995b. "Fragments of the *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra* from the P. I. Lavrov Collection. *Manuscripta Orientalia*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 9-15.
- _____, 1996. "Unknown Sanskrit Fragments from Central Asia (M. M. Berezovsky collection). *Manuscripta Orientalia*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 3-22.
- Vorobyov-Desyatovsky, V. S., 1958. "Pamyatniki tsentral'noaziatskoj pis'mennosti." *Uchenye Zapiski Instituta Vostokovedeniya*, vol. 16, pp. 304-308.
- Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, M. I., 1980. "Pervoe pechatnoe izdanie sanskrtskogo buddijskogo kanona v Tsentral'noi Azii." *Roerich Readings 1979: On the 50th Anniversary of the Institute in Uryusvati* (Conference Materials) (Novosibirsk: Siberian Branch of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR), pp. 217-222.
- _____, 1995a. "The S. E. Malov Collection of Manuscripts in the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies.." *Manuscripta Orientalia*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 29-39.
- _____, 1995b. "A Unique Manuscript of the *Kāśyapaparivarta-sūtra* in the Manuscript Collection of the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences." *Manuscripta Orientalia*, vol. 1, no. 1 (1995), pp. 12-16.
- _____, 1997. "The Ancient Manuscripts from Eastern Turkestan in the St. Petersburg Collection: Some Results of Recent Research." In *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies*, vol. 7, pp. 205-212.
- _____, 2002 (in collaboration with Seishi KARASHIMA and Noriyuki KUDO). *The Kāśyapaparivarta: Romanized Text and Facsimiles*. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica V. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.
- Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, M. I., and E. N. Tyomkin, 2003. "Fragment rukopisi 'Buddhanāma-sūtra' iz kollektsi N. F. Petrovskogo." *Scripta Gregoriana: Sbornik v chest' semidesyatletiya akademika G. M. Bongard-Levina* (Moscow: Vostochnaya Literatura), pp. 54-59.
- Watanabe, Shōgo, 1994. "A Comparative Study of the *Pañcaśīlaśāsrikā Prajñāpāramitā*." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 114, no. 3, pp. 386-395.
- Wille, Klaus, 1996. "Die Hoernle-Fragmente in der Turfan Sammlung (Berlin)." In *Turfan, Khotan und Dunhuang. Vorträge der Tagung "Annemarie von Gabain und die Turfanforschung," veranstaltet von der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin (9.-12.12.1994)*, ed. R. E. Emmerick, W. Sundermann, I. Warnke and P. Zieme. Berichte und Abhandlungen, Sonderband 1 (Berlin), pp. 385-408.
- _____, 1999. "New Fragments of the *Buddhanāmasūtra*." *Indologica Taurinensis*, vols. 23-24 (1997-98), Professor Gregory M. Bongard-Levin Felicitation Volume (Torino 1999), pp. 363-386.
- _____, 2000. *Fragments of a Manuscript of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīkasūtra from Khādaliq*. Lotus Sūtra Manuscript Series 3. Tokyo: Sōka Gakkai.

創価大学
国際仏教学高等研究所
年報

平成18年度
(第10号)

Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University
for the Academic Year 2006

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2007・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo · 2007

Some Buddhist Sanskrit Fragments from the Collection of the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences (1)*

SEISHI KARASHIMA and MARGARITA I. VOROBYOVA-DESYATOVSKAYA

(1) *Ratnarāśisūtra*

SI P/20/1 : Early South Turkestan Brāhmī : Plate 1

42 recto

1 na ca dadam̄ti · sa utpeśamānas tadbhojanam animiśair nayanaiḥ prekṣamāṇah
kṣutpipāśāparigato duḥkhām vedanām anubhavati na ca ¹¹ + + +

Śiks.57.7~9. *tatrāsyānye pretā bbojanam gr̄hītvāpadarsayanti | sa udvāśyamānas tadbhojanam
animiśābhyām netrābhyām paśyamānab kṣutpipāśāparigato duśkbām | vedanām vetti na
ca varṣasa-*

Ratnar. Tib. (Silk 1994: 453.1~7 = Mitsuhashi 2004: 94, § 4.11.2). *de der skyes nas yi dags
gzhan gyis kha zas blangs te de la bstan na / de bstan pa'i tshe mig gnyi ga mi 'dzums par
zas de la lta zhing bkres pa dang skom pas nyen pa'i sdug bsngal gyi tsbor ba myong gi / lo
brgya*

Ratnar. Chi. T.11, No.310, 644a15~17. 爾時，更有餓鬼，以食示之，而復不與。此
鬼爾時慾望欲得，諦視此食，目下曾珣，受飢渴苦，

2 hasreṇāpi tasya bhojanasya lābhī bhavati yad api kadācit karhacit tadbhojanam
pratilabdham bhavati ta[d]ā uccāram bhavati ²pū[y]. + +

Śiks.57.9~10. *basreṇāpi tasya bbojanasya lābhī bbavati | yad api kadācit karhicid bbojanam
labdbām bbavati tad uccāram bhavati pūyaṣoni-*

Ratnar. Tib. (Silk 1994: 453.7~11 = Mitsuhashi 2004: 94~95, § 4.11.2~3). *stong du yang
zas de ni thob par mi 'gyur ro // ji ste brgya la brgya lam na zas de thob kyang ngan
skyugs dang rnag kbrag tu 'gyur ro //*

Ratnar. Chi. 644a17~18. 於百千歲中，常不得食。或時得食，變爲糞屎，或作膿血。

3 tam bhavati tat kasmād dheto yathā〇pi na³ cchilavam̄to dakṣiṇīyā utpeśāpitā na ca

* Seishi Karashima is greatly indebted to Klaus Wille, Takamichi Fukita, Jundō Nagashima and Jirō Hirabayashi who read his manuscript carefully and gave him suggestions, including pointing out many corrections. He also should like to express his gratitude to the members of the Kharoṣṭī Klub, especially to Mark Allon, Andrew Glass and Stefan Baums who quickly responded to his questions about the Gāndhārī traces found in the fragment SI P/80.

¹ ++ + basreṇāpi : probably (*varṣasa*)basreṇāpi.

² pū[y]. + + tam : probably pūy(asoni) tam.

³ na : s.e. for ca?

svalābhena saṃtośit[ā]ḥ sace(t) [pu]nah kā[ś]ya + +

Śiks.57.10. tam vā

Ratnar. Tib. (Silk 1994: 453.12~17 = Mitsuhsara 2004: 95~96, § 4.11.4~4.12). de ci'i pbyir zbe na / 'di ltar des tsbul khriṃs dang ldan pa / yon tan dang ldan pa / sbyin gnas rnamis mgu bar ma byas shing / rang gi rnyed pas chog mi shes par gyur pa'i pbyir ro // 'od srung

Ratnar. Chi. 644a18~19. 何以故？有持戒人、人所敬禮僧所有物，以自在，故而難與之。迦葉！

4 yyāpatyakaro bhikṣusāṃghikena vā cāturdiśasāṃghikena vā stūpikena vā saṃsṛṣṭo bhavati tasyāham vipākam na 'vadā .. 'tat kasmā .[e] + +

Ratnar. Tib. (Silk 1994: 453.17~18 = Mitsuhsara 2004: 96, § 4.12). dge slong zhal ta byed pa gang la las dge 'dun gyi 'am / phyogs bzhi'i dge 'dun gyi 'am / mchod rten gyi tsbol bar byas na / de'i rnam par smin pa ni ngas

Ratnar. Chi. 644a19~22. 若營事比丘以常住僧物、若招提僧物及以佛物輒自雜用，得大苦報。若受一劫，若過一劫。何以故？

5 lpanāmātram etat* tato py uttareyas traīratnikam⁷ drūhati⁸ · sacet punah kāśyapa vaiyyāpatyakaro bhikṣuh imān īdrśān ādīna[va] + + +

Ratnar. Tib. (Silk 1994: 454.1~4 = Mitsuhsara 2004: 96, § 4.12~4.13.1). bskal pa bgrangs pas kyāng brjod kyis mi lang ngo // 'od srung dge slong zhal ta byed pa gang la las nyes dmigs kyi gnas 'di lta bu 'di dag thos nas /

Ratnar. Chi. 644a22~23. 以侵三寶物故。迦葉！若營事比丘聞如是罪，

42 verso

1 tvā krudhyati vyāpadyati tam aham acaikitsyam iti vadāmi¹⁰ · tasmā tarhi kāśyapa imān evaṃrūpān asaddharmān¹¹ śrutvā¹² vaiyyāpatyak. + + +

Ratnar. Tib. (Silk 1994: 454.4~6 = Mitsuhsara 2004: 96, § 4.13.1). kbros 'am / gshe 'am gnod par sems sam khong khro ba skyed na / de ni gsor mi rung ngo zhes ngas bshad do // 'od srung de lta bas na dam pa'i chos 'di lta bu 'di thos nas dge slong zhal ta byed pas

⁴ kā[ś]ya + + yyāpatyakaro: probably kā[ś]ya(pa) (vai)yyāpatyakaro.

⁵ vadā .. : probably vadā(mi).

⁶ tat kasmā .. + + lpanāmātram etat* : probably tat kasmā(d dbetor ka)lpanāmātram etat*. Cf. Abbidharmaśa-bbāya, ed. P. Pradhan, Patna 1967, p. 122, l. 23. tasmād etad api sarvam kalpanāmātram; Abhidh-k-vy = Spbuṭārtbā Abbidharmaśavyākhyā: the Work of Yaśomitra, ed. U. Wogihara, Tokyo 1936: The Publishing Association of Abhidharmaśavyākhyā; Tokyo '1989: Sankibo Buddhist Book Store, p. 302, l. 1. parikalpanāmātram etad Āgamanirapekṣam.

⁷ traīratnikam: this form is not attested elsewhere in Buddhist literature.

⁸ drūhati: < √drub. This verbal form is not attested elsewhere in Buddhist literature.

⁹ ādīna[va] + + : ādīna[va](stbānām? śru)tvā. Cf. Ratnar. Tib. nyes dmigs kyi gnas ... thos nas.

¹⁰ tam abam acaikitsyam iti vadāmi : cf. KP § 65 = KP(V-D), p. 27, l. 3f. tam abam acikitsyam iti vadāmi; Silk 1994: 336, n. 3.

¹¹ asaddharmān : = Ratnar. Chi. 非法; ≠ Ratnar. Tib. dam pa'i cbos (saddharma-); Silk 1994: 336, n. 4.

¹² vaiyyāpatyak. + + + ḷā : probably vaiyyāpatyak(arena bbikṣu)ṇā.

Ratnar. Chi. 644a23~25. 知如是罪，而故生瞋心於持戒者，我今說此諸佛世尊所不能治。迦葉！是故，營事比丘聞如是非法罪已，

2 नाकायवान्मानाह सम्वृतेन भवितव्यम्* अत्मपरारक्षणेन काश्यपा
वाय्यापत्यकरेण भिक्षुनाऽस्त्रवायाः[t] अम् + + +

Ratnar. Tib. (Silk 1994: 454.6~9 = Mitsuhsara 2004: 96, § 4.13.1~2). *lus dang ngag dang
yid yongs su dag par bya'o // bdag dang gzhan bsrung bar bya'o // 'od strung dge slong zhal
ta byed pa rang gi sha la za yang bla'i (v.l. sla'i) /*

Ratnar. Chi. 644a25~26. 應當善護身口意業，自護亦護他。迦葉！營事比丘寧自噉
身肉，

3 क्तम् भवेत न त्वं एव त्रत्नसामृष्टोऽश्ताम् सिवारम् वा पिंडपातो वा उपजीवितव्याह
अथ स्थाविरो महाकाश्यपो भगवान्तम् एतद्¹⁵ अव[०] + + +

Ratnar. Tib. (Silk 1994: 454.9~14 = Mitsuhsara 2004: 96~97, § 4.13.2~4.14). *dkon
mchog gsum gyis byin gyis brlabs pa'i lbung bzed dam / chos gos sam / bsod snyoms sam /
na ba'i gsos sman nam / yo byad yongs su spyad par ni mi bya'o // de nas bcom ldan 'das la
tsbe dang ldan pa 'od strung chen pos 'di skad ces gsol to //*

Ratnar. Chi. 644a26~28. 終不雜用三寶之物作衣鉢、飲食。爾時，摩訶迦葉白佛言：

4 भगवाम् यावत् सेमे तथागतेन माय[त्र] अचित्ततया करुणाचित्ततया वितरणाम् [सा]
वितराधर्माह प्रकाशिताह लज्जिनाम् चा¹⁶ लज्जाः[ध]. + + +

Ratnar. Tib. (Silk 1994: 454.14~455.1 = Mitsuhsara 2004: 97, § 4.14). *bcom ldan 'das kyis
lbod pa rnams kyi lbod pa'i chos dang / 'dzem mdog mchis pa rnams kyi 'dzem mdog gi
chos mams bka' tsal to //*

Ratnar. Chi. 644a28~b1. 世尊！未曾有也，如來自以慈心說如是法。爲無慚愧者，說
無慚愧法。有慚愧者，說漸愧法。

5 शिताहौ // शिताहौ // वाय्याः[पा] त्याकरापरिवर्त्ताहौ चतुरथाः समाप्ताहौ ४ // अथ स्थाविरो
महाकाश्यपः[०] भगवान्तम् एतद्¹⁷ अव० .. + + +

Ratnar. Tib. (Silk 1994: 455.2~456 = Mitsuhsara 2004: 97~98, § 4.14~5.1). *zhal ta byed
pa'i le'u ste bzbi pa'o //¹⁸*

Ratnar. Chi. 643a12. 《營事比丘品》 第四； 644b7. 爾時，摩訶迦葉白佛言

(2) *Kāśyapaparivarta*

SI P/20/2 : Early South Turkestan Brāhmī : Plate 2

[4]6 recto

1 [ā] .i[mān]i[kā imām a]nāsravām śilaviśuddhim nāvataramti . [n]āvagāhante
[n]ā[dhi]mucya[m]t[i] (·) [ga] .[bhī]r[o] kāśyapa g. + + +

¹³ *svakāyā[t]*: probably s.e. for *svakāyā[n]*.

¹⁴ [m]ām + + + *ktam*: probably [m]ām(sam api bha)ktam.

¹⁵ *av[०]* + + + : probably *av[०](cat* āscaryam)*.

¹⁶ *lajjā[db]*. + + + *śitāh*: probably *lajjā[db](armāḥ prakā)śitāh*.

¹⁷ *avo .. +*: probably *avo(cat*)*.

¹⁸ The Tibetan translation lacks a parallel to the sentence: “Then the Venerable Mahākāśyapa spoke thus to the Blessed One.”

Rec. (*bbikṣava*) [ā](bb)i[mān]i[kā imām] [a]nāśravām sīlaviśuddhiṁ nāvatarām̄ti · [n]āvagāhante [n]ā[dbi]mucya[ñ]t[i] · [ga](m)[bhi]r[o] Kāśyapa g(āthābbini-)

KP(V-D), SI P/2 § 139, 70r1~2. {an}adhimānikā te-m-anadbimucyamānā imām gambhīrā gāthābbinirhārām anāśravām sīlaviśuddhinirdeśam śrutvā nāvatarām̄ti nādbimucyam̄ti nāvagāhante tat kasmād dheto gaṇbbīro ()yam̄ Kāśyapa gāthābbini-

¹⁹Prasp. 336.3~337.5. yathōktam ĀryaRatnakūṭasūtre tathā hy ete Kāśyapa bbikṣava abhimānikā imām anāśravām sīlaviśuddhiṁ nāvataranti nāvagāhante nādbimucyanta utrasyanti samṛtrasyanti samṛtrāsam āpadyante / gambhīrab Kāśyapa gāthābbis[r]ni-

2 ... [r]. ga .bh. rā [buddhānām bhaga]○[vantān]ām bo[dh]i sā na śakyam̄m avaropitakuśalamūlaiḥ pāpamitraparigṛhitai[r a] .. .[i]mukt. + +

Rec. (rbā)r(am) ga(m)bb(i)rā [buddhānām bhagavantān]ām bo[db]i sā na śakyam̄m avaropitakuśalamūlaiḥ pāpamitraparigṛhitai[r a](nadb)[i]mukt(ibabu-)

KP(V-D), SI P/2 § 139, 70r2~3. rbāram gambhīram²⁰ buddhānām bhagavantānām bodhi sā na śkyam anavaropitakuśalamūle²¹ pāpamitraparigṛbiter anadbimuktibabu-

Prasp. 337.5~6. rbāro gambhīrā ca buddhānām bhagavatām bodhiḥ / sā na śkyā 'navaropitakuśalamūlaiḥ sattvaiḥ pāpamitraparigṛhitair anadbimuktibabu-

3 lai[r adhimok]tu[m]. ... [ni] kāśya○pa pañca bhikṣuśatāni kāśyapasya [ta] .. ga[t]. sya [p]rāvacane²² tīrthikaśrāvak. abhū +

Rec. lai[r adhimok]tu[m] (etā)[ni] Kāśyapa pañca bhikṣuśatāni Kāśyapasya [ta](thā)ga[t](a)sya [p]rāvacane tīrthikaśrāvak. abhū(vam→)

KP(V-D), SI P/2 § 139~ § 140, 70r3~5. le satvair adhimucyitum vā paryāpunitum vā avatāritum vā · api ca Kāśyapa etāni pañca bhikṣuśatāni Kāśyapasya tathāgatasyārhata samyakṣaṇibuddbasya pravacane anyatīrthikaśrāvakā abhūvan*

Prasp. 337.6~8. lair adhimoktum / api cātāni Kāśyapa pañca bhikṣuśatāni Kāśyapasya tathāgatasya pravacane 'nyatīrthikaśrāvakā abhūvan /

4 s te kāśyapasya tathāgatasyāntikād upāraṇbhābbiprāyair ekā [dha] .. + [śanā] ś[r].[r]. [tvā c](') [e]kac[i]ttaprasādo [l]. bdha [ā]ś[c]. r[y].

Rec. s te Kāśyapasya tathāgatasyāntikād upāraṇbhābbiprāyair ekā dba(rmade)śanā ś(rutā s)r(u)tvā c(') ekacittaprasādo l(a)bdha āśc(a)ry(am)

KP(V-D), SI P/2 § 140, 70r5~70v1. ²³ te²⁴ Kāśyapasya tathāgatasyāntikād upāraṇbhābbiprāyair ekā dharmadeśanā śrutā śrutvā c() eva cittaprasādo labdba āścaryam

Prasp. 337.8~9. tair eva tasya Kāśyapasya tathāgatasyāntikād upālambhābbiprāyair eṣā dharmadeśanā śrutā śrutvā cākacittaprasādo labdbhaḥ / evam tair vāgbhāṣitā āścaryam

¹⁹ Karashima is greatly indebted to Jundō Nagashima who pointed out the following parallel passages, found in the *Prasannapadā*.

²⁰ A scribal error for gambhīrā.

²¹ The forms °mūle, °grbīter and °babule are inst. pl.

²² {p}rāvacane : cf. BHSD, s.v. prāvacana. The word prāvacana~ occurs also at Mvu III 234.20, 245.8, 270.6; BhīVin(Mā-L), § 8, 1A3.2~3, § 113, 2B8.3; PrMoSū(Mā-L), p. 4, l. 2; SP(O). 388b2, 416b1.

²³ Or a scribal error for abhūvans.

²⁴ <taiḥ (inst. pl.).

[4]6 verso

- 1 yāvan madhurapriya[bh]āñī tathāgato + .. myaksam̄buddha iti • te eke[na c]. tta[pr]. + [d]. [n]. ... ga[tā]s tr[ā]yastr. ... +[ū] +
 Rec.yāvan madburapriyabhāñī tathāgato (rbāñī sa)myaksam̄buddha iti • te ekena
 c(i)ttapr(asā)d(e)n(a) (kāla)gatās trāyastr(iñśeṣu deveṣ)ū(pa)<pa->
 KP(V-D), SI P/2 § 140, 70v1~3. yāvan madburapriyabhāñī khalu eyaṁ²⁵ Kāśyapas tathāgato
 (rbāñī samyaksam̄buddha iti • te tatas cyuta samānā ekacittaprasādena kālagatāḥ
 trāyastrim̄seṣu deveṣūpapa-
- Prasp. 337.9~11. yāvan madburapriyabhāñī Kāśyapas tathāgato 'rhan samyaksam̄buddha iti
 / ta etenākacittaprasādena pratilabdhena kālagatāḥ trāyastrim̄seṣu deveṣūpapa-
- 2 .. ās tenaiva ca hetunā i○ + mama śāsane pravrājītās tā(n)y etāni kā(sya)pa pañca
 bhikṣuśatāni dṛṣṭipra[s]kandhitā +
 Rec.(nn)ās tenaiva ca hetunā i(ba) mama śāsane pravrājītās tā(n)y etāni kā(sya)pa pañca
 bbikṣuśatāni dṛṣṭipraskandhitā(ni)
 KP(V-D), SI P/2 § 140, 70v3~4. nnāḥ ten(‘) eva betunā iba mama śāsane pravrājītāḥ tāny
 etāni Kāśyapa pañca bbikṣuśatāni dṛṣṭigatapraskandhitāni
 Prasp. 337.11~12. nnās te tatas cyutāḥ samānā ibhāpānās tenāva ca betunēha mama
 śāsane pravrājītās tāny etāni Kāśyapa pañca bbikṣuśatāni dṛṣṭipraskandhitāni
- 3 [i]mā dharmadeśanā[m] nāvata○[ra]m[t]. āva[gā]hanti • nādhimucyante .rtam [pu] ..
 [r e]ś[ām]. .. yām dharma .e[śa] .. + +
 Rec.imā dharmadeśanām nāvatarām(i) (n)āvagāhanti • nādhimucyante (k)rtam pu(na)r
 eśām (ana)yām dharma(d)eśa(nāyā)
 KP(V-D), SI P/2 § 140, 70v4~5. imām gambbirā dharmadeśanā nāvatarāmti nāvagāhamti
 nādhimucyamte na śraddadhamti • kṛtam punar²⁶eśā (‘)mayam dharmadeśanāyā
 Prasp. 337.12~338.2. mām gambbirām dharmadeśanām nāvataranti nāvagāhante
 nādhimucyanta uttrasyanti samtrāsam āpadyante / kṛtam punar eśām anayā
 dharmadeśanayā
- 4 [p]. .[ik]. [rm]. na bhūyo [vi] .[ip]ātagāmino bhaviṣya<m>ti • ebbir e .. [ska]ndhai[s]
 pa[r]ji[n]irvā[sy]. .. + + +
 Rec.p(ar)ik(a)rm(a) na bhūyo vi(n)ipātagāmino bhaviṣya<m>ti • ebbir e(va) skandhai
 parinirvāsy(amti • ¶?)
 KP(V-D), SI P/2 § 140~§ 141, 70v5~71r1. parikarma na bhūyo vi[n]ipātagāmino
 bhaviṣyamti • ebbir eva skandhaiḥ parinirvāsyamti • ¶ tatra bhagavān
 Prasp. 338.2~4. parikarma na bhūyo durgativinipātam gamiṣyanti / ebbir eva ca skandhaiḥ
 pari<nir>vāsyanti // atha khalu bhagavān āyuṣmantam Subbūtim āmantrayate sma /

(3) *Anirud(db)a-sūtra

SI P/80 : Turkestan Gupta type²⁷ : Plate 3²⁵ A scribal error for ayam?²⁶ eśā (‘)mayam : < eśām (gen. pl.) imayā (Pāli inst. sg. fem.)?²⁷ Cf. Sander 1968: Tafel 29, q; do. 1986: 160f.

This fragment contains the following peculiar forms: *cita* (< Skt. *citta*; r7), *babutā* (< Skt. *bahudbhā*; r3), *vividā~* (< Skt. *vividbhā*; r2), *Aniruda* (< BHS. *Aniruddha*; r1, 6, v2, 6), *viśuda~* (< Skt. *viśuddha*; v6), *bāvitatvā* (< Skt. *bhāvitatvāt*; r5, 6, v2, 6), *samaññamāgatā* (< **samaññvāgatā* < Skt. *samanvāgatā*; v7. Cf. GDhp. *amedi* < **anñvedi* < Skt. *anveti*), *kama~* (probably a scribal error for *katama~*; r2, 5, 6), *emāyusparayamta* (< *ema āyus°* < *evam āyus°*?; v5. Cf. Gāndhārī *ema*, *emu* < Skt. *evam*), *pratyurnnabbavastī*²⁸ (a scribal error for *pratyanubhāvasti*; r3). From these peculiar forms, we may assume that the mother tongue of the scribe of this fragment was Gāndhārī and its peculiarities crept into the manuscript. It is also probable that the text, to which this fragment belonged, was transmitted at a certain stage in Gāndhārī.

[50] *recto*

1 || evam mayā śrutam ekasmīm samaye āyuṣmām Aniruda²⁹ Śrāvastyā viharati sma Jetavane Anāthapiṇḍadasyārāme atha saṁbahulā bhikṣava[h] yena + ///

Cf. SN V 303.5f. ekam samayam āyasmā Anuruddho Sāvatthiyam vibarati Jetavane Anāthapiṇḍikassa ārāme. atha kho sambulā bbikkhū yenāyasmā Anuruddho ten' upasākamīmsu. upasākamitvā āyasmata Anuruddbenā; cf. also SN V 294.5f. evam me sutam. ekam samayam āyasmā Anuruddho Sāvatthiyam vibarati Jetavane Anāthapiṇḍikassa ārāme.

Cf. CSĀ, T. 2, No. 99, 140a26f. 如是我聞：一時佛住舍衛國祇樹給孤獨園，……爾時尊者阿難往尊者阿那律所；cf. also CSĀ. 140c25f. 如是我聞：一時佛住舍衛國祇樹給孤獨園，時尊者阿那律，在舍衛國松林精舍。時有衆多比丘，詣尊者阿那律所

2 sārdham sammukham sammodanī samramjanī kathām vividām³⁰ upasāñhṛty ekā<m>te nyāśidād³¹ ekāmpte³² niṣaṇṇā ās te bhikṣavo āyuṣmām Ani<rū>dam etad avocat*³³ kam[e]śām[m³⁴ ā] ///

Cf. SN V 303.9f. saddhim sammodim̄su sammodanīyam katham sārāñiyam vītisāretvā ekam antam niśidim̄su. ekam antam niśinnā kho te bbikkhū āyasmantam Anuruddham etad avocum: "katamesam āyasmā Anuruddho dhammānam bhāvitattā babulikatattā mahābbiññātam patto?" ti.

Cf. CSĀ. 140a29f. 共相問訊、慰勞已，於一面坐。尊者阿難問尊者阿那律：“於何功德修習，多修習，

²⁸ This form seems to show the influence of Gāndhārī, in which a geminate was occasionally marked by the insertion of a non-historic *r* before an *akṣara*, such as *uparno* < Skt. *utpānnah*, *bbirno* < Skt. *bbinnam* (cf. Salomon 1999: 122-123).

²⁹ *Aniruda* : < BHS *Aniruddha*.

³⁰ *vividām* : < Skt. *vividbā~*.

³¹ *nyāśidād* : a singular form with a plural subject; cf. BHSG § 25.22.

³² *niṣaṇṇā ās te* : s.e. for *niṣaṇṇās te?*

³³ *avocat* : a singular form with a plural subject; cf. BHSG § 25.22.

³⁴ *kam[e]śām[m]* : probably a scribal error for *ka<t>mesāmm*.

³⁵ [ā] /// : probably [ā](yūṣmām) ///

3 viddham³⁶ pratyurnnabhavasi³⁷ • eko bhūtvā bahutā³⁸ bhavasi bahutā³⁹ bhūtvā eko
bhavasi • āvirbhāvam tirobhāvam tiraskuḍyam tira[h](p)[r](āk)[āram] t[i|r]. + + +
///

Cf. SN V 303.22f. *imesañ ca panābam āvuso catunnam satipatibhānānam* (\leftarrow °*anānam*)
bbāvitattā babulikatattā anekavibitam iddbividbam paccanubhomī. eko pi butvā babudbhā
homī, babudbhā butvā eko homī, āvibbhāvam tirobbhāvam tirokuddam tiropākāram
tiropabbatam asajjamāno gacchāmi seyyathāpi ākāse. paṭhaviyam pi ummujjanimujjam
karomī seyyathāpi (cf. also SN V 274.13f.)

Cf. CSA. 140b2f. 成就如是大德、大力、大神通？” 尊者阿那律語尊者阿難：“我於四念處修習，多修習，成此大德大力。……”

Cf. SBV II 246.13f. *sa evam samābite citte pariśuddhe paryavatādāte anaṅgaṇe vigatopakleśe rijubbūte karmanye stbite āniñjyaprāpte rddhiviṣayasāksātkriyāyām abbijñāyām cittam abbinirṇamayya so 'nekavīdhām rddhiviṣayaṁ pratyānubhavati. tadyathā eko bhūtvā babudbā bbavati. babudbā bhūtvāiko bbavati. āvirbhāvam tirobbhāvam jñānadarśanena pratyānubhavati. tirabkudyam tirabhsailam tirabprākāram asajjamānah kāyena gacchati tadyathā ākāśe. prthivyām unmajjanimajjanam karoti tadyathā*

Cf. SN V 303.23. udake. udake pi abbijjamāno gacchāmi seyyathāpi paṭhaviyam. ākāse pi pallanikena kamāmi seyyathāpi pakkbī sakuno. ime pi candimasuriye evam mabiddhike evam mabānubhāve pāninā pārāmasāmi parimajjāmi (cf. also SN V 274.16f.)

Cf. SBV II 246.20f. udake. udake abbinnasroto gacchatī tadyathā prtbivyām. ākāśe paryāñkena krāmati (← °enātikrāmati) tadyathā pakṣī śakunib. imau vā punab sūryācandramasāv evam mahārdhikāv evam mahānubhāvau pāniñā āmārsti parimārsti

Cf. SN V 303.24f. yāva brabmalokāpi kāyena vasam vattemī"ti. (304.2f.) imesam ca panābam āvuso catunnam satipatṭhānānam bhāvitattā babulikatattā dibbāya sotadbātuyā visuddhāya atikkantamānussikāya ubbo sadde sunāmi dibbe

Cf. SBV II 246.23f. *yāvad brabmalokam kāyena vase vartayati* (247.1f.) so 'nekāvidham

³⁶ *viddham*: < Skt. -*vidham*.

³⁷ *pratyurnnabbavasi*: probably a scribal error for *pratyamubbavasi*.

³⁸ *babutā*: < Skt. *babudhā-*

³⁹ *babutā* : < Skt. *babudhā-*

⁴⁰ *dake*: probably (*u*)*dake*

⁴¹ *sakunih*: probably a scribal error for *sakunih*

⁴² [p] = h [sūrvāca] = m [xu]: probably p(una)h sūrvāca(ndra)m(as)u

⁴³ *trparivartakena* : < **tri-parivartaka*-. In the SBV, the description “*so nekāvidbām yddbriṣayam
pratyavubhāvati tadvatbhā eko bhūtvā habudhā bhāvati*...” is repeated three times.

⁴⁴ *kameśāmm*: probably a scribal error for *kastomesāmm*

⁴⁵ [h]([ā]) [v]([i]) [t]([atv]) [ā]: < Skt. *hhāvitatvāt*

⁴⁶ + by + + + +; probably (*ha*)*bu*(*likratayā*)

Cf. SN V 304.4f. ca mānusse (v.l. mānuse) ca ye dūre santike cā”ti. “imesañ ca panāham āvuso catunnām satipaṭṭhānām bbāvitattā babulikatattā parasattānam parapuggalānam cetesā ceto paricca pajānāmi. sarāgām vā cittām sarāgām cittan ti pajānāmi. vī- (cf. also SN V 265.12f.)

Cf. SBV II 248.4f. mānusyān apy amānusyān api. ye 'pi dūre ye 'py antike. 248.16f. sa evaṁ samāhite citte pariśuddhe cetaḥparyāyajñānasākṣatkriyāyāṁ abhijñāyāṁ cittam abbinirṇamayati sa parasatvānāṁ (\leftarrow °sattvānāṁ) parapudgalānāṁ vitarkitāṁ vicāritāṁ mānasā mānasām yathābhūtaṁ prajānāti. sarāgaṁ cittam sarāgaṁ cittam iti yathābhūtaṁ prajānāti. viga-

Cf. SN V 304.9. *tarāgam* vā *cittam* *vitarāgam* *cittan ti pajānāmi*, *sadosam* vā *cittam* *sadosam* *cittan ti pajānāmi*, *vitadosam* vā *cittam* *vitadosam* *cittan ti pajānāmi*, *samobam* vā *cittam* *samobam* *cittan ti pajānāmi*, *vitamobam* vā *cittam* *vitamobam* *cittan ti pajānāmi*, *saṅkbittam* vā *cittam* *saṅkhittam* *cittan ti pajānāmi*, *vikkhittam* vā *cittam* *vikkhittam* *cittan ti pajānāmi*. (cf. also SN V 265.12f.)

Cf. SBV II 248.21f. *tarāgam cittam vigatarāgam cittam iti yathābhūtam prajānāti. sadvesam*
vigatadveśam samoban̄am vigatamoham sāṃkṣiptam vikṣiptam

[50] verso

Cf. SN V 304.9. mahaggatam vā cittam mahaggatam cittan ti pajānāmi, amahaggatam vā cittam amahaggatam cittan ti pajānāmi, sauṭṭaram vā cittam sauṭṭaram cittan ti pajānāmi, anuttaram vā cittam anuttaram cittan ti pajānāmi, asamāhitam vā cittam asamāhitam

⁴⁷ *s*: (*amānuśā*)*s*?

⁴⁸ *kamesāmm*: probably a scribal error for *ka<ta>mēsāmm*.

⁴⁹ *Aniruda*: < BHS *Aniruddha*.

⁵⁰ *hāvitatuā*: < Skt. *hhāvitatuāt*.

⁵¹ [par]. [satvān].m .. .[u] .. + [n]ām ce .. + : probably [par](a)[satvān](ā)m (parap)[u](dgalā)nām ce(tesā).

⁵² *citam*: < Skt. *cittam*.

⁵³ .. + + + + mo ..m : probably (*samobam vigata*)mo(ba)m.

⁵⁴ *sa...t+t+ktam c.t*: probably *sa(mābitam avimū)ktam c(ittam)*.

cittan ti pajānāmi, samābitam vā cittam samābitam cittan ti pajānāmi, avimuttam vā cittam avimuttam cittan ti pajānāmi, vimuttam vā cittam vimuttam cittan ti pa- (cf. also SN V 265.18f.)

Cf. SN V 304.10. jānāmīti. 305.13f. imesañ ca panâbām āvuso catunnām satipaṭṭhānānam bbāvitattā babulikatattā anekavihitam pubbenivāsām anussarāmi. seyyathidam ekam pi jātim due pi jātiyo tisso pi jātiyo catasso pi jātiyo pañca pi jātiyo dasa pi jātiyo vīsam pi jātiyo timsam pi jātiyo (cf. also SN V 265.28f.)

Cf. SBV II 248.26. *jānāti* (249.3f.) *sa evam samābhite citte ... pūrvanivāsānusmṛtiñānasaṅkṣatkriyāyām <abbijñāyām> cittam abhinirṇamayati. so 'nekaviddham pūrvanivāsam samanusmarati. tadyathā ekam api due tisraś catastrah pañcā sat saptastau nava daśa vimsatam trimśatam*

Cf. SN V 305.15. *cattālisam pi jātiyo pāññāsam pi jātiyo jātisatam pi jātisabassam pi jātisatasabassam pi* (cf. also SN V 265.31f.)

Cf. SBV II 249.7f. *catvāriṁśatam pañcāśatam jātiśatam jātisahasram jātiśatasahasram*
anekāny api jātiśatāni anekāny api jātisahasrāṇi anekāny api jātiśatasahasrāṇi
samvartakalpaṁ api vivarta-

4⁶¹.. Ipam vā samvartavivartakalpam vā anekā O ni vā samvartakalpāni-m-anekāni vā
vi<va>rtakalpāni an[e]kāni vā [sam] + + + + //

Cf. SN V 305.15. aneke pi samvattakappe aneke pi vivattakappe aneke pi samvattavivattakappe amutrāsim evamnāmo (\leftarrow evam nāmo) evamgotto evamvanño eva- (cf. also SN V 266.2f.)

Cf. SBV II 249.10f. *kalpam api sañvartavivartakalpam api anekān api sañvartakalpān*
anekān api vivartakalpān anekān api sañvartavivartakalpān samanusmarati. amī nāma
te bhāvantab satvā (← sattvā) yatrāham āsam evamnāmā evamītya evamgootra eva-

⁶² māhāra evamsukhadu[*h*]kha pratisamvedī emāyus paryamta so (')*ham tataś cuta samāna*

⁵⁵ *jāmi*: probably a scribal error for (*pra*)*jā<npā>si*.

⁵⁶ Aniruda: < BHS *Aniruddha*

⁵⁷ *hāvitativā* : < Skt. *bhāvitativāt*

⁵⁸ *a[n]e ... i ...m [pūrvenivā]sa ... + .. rati*: probably *ane(kav)i(da)m pūrvenivāsa(m samanusma)rati* (s.e. for ^o*rati*?)

⁵⁹ [*gnek*]. *Inli*: probably *gnek(ā)ni*

⁶⁰ *jātisīl* [jāl] i [al] e [ā]m[sil]: probably *jātis*(*st*)āni a(n)e(k)āni

⁶¹ *lparam*: probably *(ka)lprom*

⁶² *emāyuspariyamta* : a scribal error for *e<va>māyus*° or <*ema āyus*° <*evam āyus*° (cf. Gāndhārī *ema emu* Skt. *avam*)

amutropapanna itaś cuta samāna⁶³ iho[pa] .. [nn]. i .. + + //

Cf. SN V 305.15f. mābāro evaṇṣukhadukkha-paṭisaṁvedī evamāyupariyanto. so tato cuto amutra uppādim (v.l. *udapādi*). tatratvāsim evamnāmo evamgotto evaṇṭvāṇo evamābāro evaṇṣukhadukkha-paṭisaṁvedī evamāyupariyanto so tato cuto idbupapanno ti. iti sākāraṇ sauddesam anekāvibitam pubbenivāsam anussarāmī”ti (cf. also SN V 266.4f.)

Cf. SBV II 249.13f. mābāra evaṇṣukhadubhkba-pratisaṁvedī evamdirghbāyuh (← °dirgh°) evaṇci-ras-thitika evamāyuṣpar-yantab. so 'ham tasmāt sthānāc cyuto 'mutrōpapannab. tasmād api cyuto 'mutrōpapannab. tasmād api cyutab ihōpapanna iti. sākāraṇ soddeśam anekāvidhām pūrvanivāsam anusmarati

6 smāmn Aniruda⁶⁴ dharmāñā bāvitatuā⁶⁵ bahulikttatvā divyena cakṣusā “viśudenātikrāntamānuṣena satvām paśyasi cavamānām upapadyamān[ā](m) //”

Cf. SN V 305.18f. imesañ ca panāham āvuso catunnām satipaṭṭhānānam bhāvitattā babulīkatattā dibbena cakkhunā visuddhena atikkantamānussakena (v.l. °mānusakena) satte passāmi cavamāne uppajjamāne bīne pañite suvanne dubbañne sugate duggate yathākammūpage (← °upage) (cf. also SN V 266.11f.)

Cf. CSĀ. 140b9f. 我於此四念處，修習，多修習。少方便，以淨天眼，過天人眼，見諸衆生、死時、生時，好色、惡色，上色、下色，善趣、惡趣，隨業受生。

Cf. SBV II 250.3f. sa evam samābīte citte pariśuddhe ... cyutyupapādajñānasāksātkriyāyām abbijñāyām cittam abbinirñāmayati divyena cakṣusā viśuddhenātikrāntamānusyakena satvān (← *sattvān*) paśyati cyavamānān upapadyamānān api suvarṇān api durvarṇān api bīnān api prañitān api sugatim api gacchato durgatim api yathākarmōpayo-

7 .[ā]⁶⁶ satvām yathābhūtam prajāsi⁶⁸ ime bhavamti⁶⁹ satvā kāyaduścaritenā samāmmāgata⁷⁰ vāgduścaritenā manoduścaritenā āryāñāmm anupav[ā]⁷¹ //

Cf. SN V 305.19. satte pajānāmi. ime vata bbonto sattā kāyaduccaritenā samannāgataā vacīduccaritenā (← °duca°) samannāgataā manoduccaritenā samannāgataā ariyānam upavādakā (cf. also SN V 266.14f.)

Cf. CSĀ. 140b12f. 皆如實見。此諸衆生身惡行，口、意惡行，誹謗賢聖，……

Cf. SBV II 250.8f. gāt satvān (← *sattvān*) yathābbūtam prajānāti. amī bhavantab satvāb (← *sattvāb*) kāyaduścaritenā samanvāgataā vāñmanoduścaritenā samanvāgataā āryāñām apavādakā

⁶³ iho[pa] .. [nn]. i .. : probably *ihōpa(pa)mn(a) i(ti)*.

⁶⁴ Aniruda : < BHS *Aniruddha*.

⁶⁵ bāvitatuā : < Skt. *bhāvitattā*.

⁶⁶ viśudena : < Skt. *viśuddbena*.

⁶⁷ .[ā] : probably (*yathākarmōpayogā*).ā.

⁶⁸ prajāsi : probably a scribal error for *prajā<nā>si*.

⁶⁹ bhavamti : s.e. for °vamto?

⁷⁰ samāmmāgataā : < *samañtvāgataā < Skt. *samanvāgataā*. Cf. GDhp. *amedī* < *amvedī < Skt. *anveti*.

⁷¹ anupav[ā] // : read {an}upavā(dakā)?

SYMBOLS

()	restored <i>akṣara</i> (s)
[]	damaged <i>akṣara</i> (s)
< >	omitted (part of) <i>akṣara</i> (s) without gap in the MS.
{ }	superfluous <i>akṣara</i> (s) or a <i>danda</i>
—	erased <i>akṣara</i> (s), e.g. <i>vijñā</i>
+	one lost <i>akṣara</i>
..	one illegible <i>akṣara</i>
.	illegible part of an <i>akṣara</i>
*	<i>virāma</i>
○	string hole
¶	punctuation mark
$\alpha \leftarrow \beta$	the word form β should be changed to α
.....	Chinese character(s) with a dotted underline indicates a proper name, e.g. 舍利弗

ABBREVIATIONS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

BhiVin(Mā-L) = *Bbikṣuṇī-Vinaya, including Bbikṣuṇī-Prakīrṇaka and a Summary of the Bbikṣu-Prakīrṇaka of the Ārya-Mabāśāṃghika-Lokottaravādin*, ed. Gustav Roth, Patna (*Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series* 12).

BHS = Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit

BHS(D, G) = Franklin Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, 2 vols., New Haven 1953 : Yale University Press; repr. Delhi, 1970 : Motilal Banarsi Dass.

CSĀ = the Chinese translation of the *Samyuktāgama*, T. 2, No. 99.

GDhp = John Brough, *The Gāndhārī Dhāraṇapada*, London 1962: Oxford University Press (*London Oriental Series*, vol. 7).

KP(V-D) = *The Kāśyapaparivarta: Romanized Text and Facsimiles*, ed. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya in collaboration with Seishi Karashima and Noriyuki Kudo, Tokyo 2002: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University (*Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica* V).

Mitsuhara, Hōshū 蜜波羅鳳洲

2004 *Bon-Zō-Kan-Wa Taishō Hōjukyō* 梵藏漢和対照研究 宝聚經 (*Ratnarakṣi-sūtra*), Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.

Mvu = *Le Mahāvastu*, ed. Émile Senart, 3 vols, Paris 1882-1897: Imprimerie nationale; Reprint: Tokyo 1977: Meicho-Fukyū-Kai.

Pa = Pāli

Prasp = *Mūlamadhyamakārikās (Mādhyamikasūtra) de Nāgārjuna avec la Prasannapadā Commentaire de Candrakīrti*, ed. Louis de la Vallée Poussin, St.-Petersburg, 1903-10 (*Bibliotheca Buddhica* IV).

PrMoSū(Mā-L) = *Prātimokṣasūtram of the Lokottaravādīmabāśāṅghika School*, ed. Nathmal Tatia, Patna 1976 (*Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series* 16).

PTS = The Pali Text Society

Ratnar. Chi. = the Chinese translation of the *Ratnarakṣi-sūtra*, T.11, No.310.

Ratnar. Tib. = the Tibetan translation of the *Ratnarakṣi-sūtra*.

Rec. = Reconstructed Text.

Salomon, Richard

1999 *Ancient Buddhist Scrolls from Gandhāra: the British Library Kharoṣṭī Fragments*, Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Sander, Lore

1968 *Paläographisches zu den Sanskrithandschriften der Berliner Turfansammlung*, Wiesbaden (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, hrsg. v. Wolfgang Voigt, Suppl.-Bd. 8).

1986 "Brāhmī Scripts on the Eastern Silk Roads," in: *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 11/12 (1986), pp. 159-192.

SBV = *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅgababbhedavastu, being the 17th and Last Section of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin*, ed. Raniero Gnoli, 2 parts, Roma 1978 (SOR 49/1-2).

s.e. = scribal error

Śikṣ = Śikṣāsamuccaya : A Compendium of Buddbistic Teaching, Compiled by Śāntideva, ed. Cecil Bendall, St. Petersbourg 1902: Académie Imperiale des Sciences; Reprint Tokyo 1977: Meicho-Fukyū-kai (Bibliotheca Buddhica 1).

Silk, Jonathan Alan

1994 *The Origins and Early History of the Mahāratnakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddbism with a Study of the Ratnarāśisūtra and Related Materials*, Diss. University of Michigan.

SI P = Central Asian fragments in the Petrovsky collection of St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences, with the siglum Ser India Petrovskij.

SN = Saṃyutta-Nikāya, ed. L. Feer, 5 vols., London 1884-1898 (PTS), vol. 6 (Indexes by C. A. F. Rhys Davids), London 1904 (PTS).

T = Taisbō Shinsbū Daizōkyō 大正新修大藏經, ed. Junjirō Takakusu, Kaikyoku Watanabe, 100 vols., Tokyo 1924-1934.

w.r. = wrong reading

創価大学
国際仏教学高等研究所
年報

平成19年度
(第11号)

Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University
for the Academic Year 2007

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2008・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo · 2008

Buddhist Sanskrit Fragments from the Collection of The Institute of Oriental Manuscripts in St. Petersburg (2)*

SEISHI KARASHIMA and MARGARITA I. VOROBYOVA-DESYATOVSKAYA

SI P/67(2) : Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra : Plate 1

Inventory No. 2092, fr. 1; 19×14.5 cm

South Turkestan Brāhmī (main type)

SP(O) 67r1~68r3; KN 62.1~63.5 (identified by Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya)

recto

- 1 /// + [bh]. ṣṭāḥ balā vimokṣāś ca mi sarvi
- 2 /// + + nararśabhbhānām aśīti pūrnāḥ
- 3 /// + [h](a) vañcito (')smi 6 daśaddiśe lo
- 4 /// + .[ā]vihārā gamiyāna ekakah
- 5 /// + nukampī asamgajñānī ca anam̄taca
- 6 /// [k]ātu 8 rātrodīvāni¹ kṣapayā
- 7 /// + .[i]dam eva-m-artham kiṁ bhrraṣṭa evā
- 8 /// + + t[r]odiva² nityakālam* dṛṣṭvā ca a-

Cf. SP(O) *dvātriṁśatilakṣaṇa bbrraṣṭa mabyam suvarṇavarnacchavi_(67r1)tā ca bbrraṣṭā · balā vimokṣāś ca mi sarvi riñcitās tulyeṣu dharmeṣu abo (')smi mūḍha 5 anuvyan_(67r2)janaḥ ye ca nararśabhbhānām aśīti pūrnāḥ pravarā viśiṣṭā · aśādaśāveṇikabuddhadharmāś te_(67r3)bhiś ca bbraṣṭo (')smṛ ha vañcito (')smi <6> // daśandīśe loki viguṣṭaśabdā dṛṣṭvāna te lokabitānukampa_(67r4)kā divāvihā○rā gamiyāna ekaka · hā vam̄cito (')smīti vi[vi]cīntayāmi 7 dṛṣṭvā ca_(67r5) ta lokabitānukampī asamgajñānī ca anam̄tacakṣu · hā vam̄cito (')smīti vicintayāmi 8 asamgajñānātū acintikātu 8 rātrodīvāni kṣapayāmi nāyako bhūyistha_(67r7)to eva vicintayanta · prchāmī bhagavān idam eva-m-artham kiṁ bbrraṣṭa evāśmy atha vā_(67v1) (')py abrraṣṭa 9 prapañcayam̄tasya mi eva nāyaka gacchaṇti rātrodīva nityakālam* dṛṣṭvā ca a-*

* Seishi Karashima is greatly indebted to Klaus Wille, Takamichi Fukita and Jundō Nagashima who read his manuscript carefully and gave him suggestions, including pointing out many corrections.

¹ *rātrodīvāni* : = SP(O); cf. KN 62.7. *rātriṁdīvāni*.

² + *trodīva* : cf. SP(O) *rātrodīva* ([m.c.] **rātrodīvā* < Skt. *ratrau* + *divā*); KN 62.9. *rātriṁdīva*.

³ (')smṛ ha : s.e. for (')smī abra.

verso

- 1 /// + .[i]tvā ima buddhagh[o]ṣa[m] sandhā
 2 /// + + na bodhimaṇḍāḥ⁴ 11 drṣṭīvilagno hy a
 3 /// .. nāyako drṣṭīvīmokṣaya bravī
 4 /// + [h]a sparśayitvā • tat[o] vijānā
 5 /// + dā tu buddho bhavate (')grasatvaḥ pura
 6 /// + + [ṣ]. to nirvṛti tatra [bh]oti 14 vya
 7 /// + + [y]adā pi vyākurvasi agrabo
 8 /// + .. tatvam̄ prathamā girā śrutva [v]ināya

Cf. SP(O) (67v2) *{a}ñyā babu bodhisatvāḥ samvarṇitā lokavināyakebbiḥ <10> so (')bam̄ śruṇitvā ima buddhagbo_(67v3)sam* sandhāya-m-etat kila dharmā bhāṣitam* atarkike sūkṣmi-m-anāśrave ca jñāne praneti ji_(67v4)pa bodhimandā 11 drṣṭīvilagno by abam̄ āsi pūrve tīrthyaparivrrājakasañmatas ca tato (67v5) mama āśayu jñātva nāyako drṣṭīvīmokṣaya bravīśi nirvṛtim* 12 vimu<m>ciyam̄ dr_(67v6)stigatāni sarve suśunya dharmam̄ aba sparsayitvā tato vijānāmy aba nirvṛto (')smi na cā_(67v7)pi nirvāṇam̄ idam̄ praka{t}thyate 13 yadā tu buddho bhavate (←bhavave [s.e.]) (')grasatvaḥ puraskṛto naramaruyakṣa_(68v1)rākṣasai • dvātrīṁśatimlakṣaṇarūpadhārī aśesato nirvṛti tatra bhoti (←doti [s.e.]) 14 vyāpanīta sarve ma_(68v2)ma manyitāni śrutvā tu ghoṣam̄ abam̄ adya nirvṛtib yadā (')pi vyākurvasi agrabodhau purato (←śurato [s.e.]) (68v3) hi lokasya sadevakasya 15 balavaṇṭam̄ āsi mama cchāmbitatvam̄ prathamā girā śrutva vināya_(68v4)kasya :*

SI P/67(2) : Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra : Plate 2

Inventory No. 2092, fr. 2; 17×10 cm

South Turkestan Brāhmī (main type)

SP(O) 95v6~96r5; SI P/20.4(2) recto 6~verso 5 (BV 16); Wi 44: Fragment 18 verso;
KN 91.2~92.4 (identified by Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya)*recto*

- u /// + + + + + + .. .[t]. + + +
 v /// + + + + + .. [r](i)tuś ca mā[sā] : sam ..
 w /// + + [t]nā[m]. [y]. yānam idam̄ pravucya
 x /// .. ḥ śruṇonti [y]e ca sugata[s]ya śrāva
 y /// + kahimcīt* daśaḥ diśam̄ sarva gate⁵
 z /// + .. .[ā] tuhasme⁶ • mayā ca niṣkāsi

Cf. SP(O) (95v6) *ayam ratho edṛśako viśiṣṭam rama<m>ti yena sada buddhaputra <5>5 krrīdaṇti etena kṣape<m>ti rā_(95v7)trīyā divasāś ca pakṣas ca ritus ca māsā • sa<m>vatsarān antarakalpa-*
m-eva ca kṣape{: //} (96r1)nti kalpāna sahasrakotaya <5>6 ratnāmayam yānam (←yāvam [s.e.])

⁴ bodhimandāḥ : or °manḍāḥ; cf. SP(O) °manḍā; KN 62.12. °manḍe.

⁵ gate : probably s.e. for gave; cf. KN 91.8. gaveśayitvā.

⁶ tubasme : probably s.e. for *(')ha ([m.c.] < abam̄) tusme ("I am your [father]."); cf. SP(O) pitā (')⁷ha tusmi; KN 91.9. abam̄ pitā vo. The gen. pl. form tusme occurs also in SP(O) 182r3. atra tusme yāni kānicit karaṇīyāni tāni sarvāṇi kurvathā; cf. KN 188.2. atra vo yāni kānicit karaṇīyāni tāni sarvāṇi kurudhvam. Cf. also BHSG § 20.62.

idam pravucyate yo gacchatī yen(?) iha_(96r2) bodhimandam* vikṛīdamāni babu bodhisatvāḥ śrno(m)ti
ye ca sugatasya śrāvakā <5>7 evam̄ pra_(96r3) jānāhi tva Śāriputra nāstīha yānam̄ dvitiyam̄ kabimciit*
daśa<d>diśam̄ sarva gamiṣayitvā_(96r4) sthāpya-m-upāyam̄ pu○ruṣottamānām* <5>8 putrā mama
yuṣmi pitā (?)ha tusmi mayā ca ni_(96r5) skāsi-

verso

- 1 /// ... bh[ai]ravātu 59 evam̄ a
- 2 /// .. duḥkhāni kṣapitva muktā • bodhā
- 3 /// n[va]nti sarve iha⁷ dharmanetṛi • u
- 4 /// + [y](a)m [61 h]īnešu kāmešu jugu
- 5 /// + + ⁸+ + + .o • [āśca]rya[m] i ..

Cf. SP(O) *ta yuṣmi dubkhai* *paridabyamānā babuduḥkhakoṭibhis traidhā<tukā>tu bhayabhairavātu 59 e_(96r6)vam̄ ahām tvā vadi tatra nirvṛti • anirvṛtā yuṣmi vadāmi adya • samsāradubkhāni kṣapitva_(96r7) muktā bodhāya yānam̄ tu gavesitavyam̄ 60 ye kecit santi iha bodhisatvā • śrīvanti sarve i_(96v1)ma dbarmanetṛi • upāyakauśalya tathāgatānām̄ yathā vinenti babusatva bodhayam̄ 61 hīne_(96v2)su kāmešu jugupsikešu raman̄ti ye tatra babūni bālāḥ duḥkhām̄ tato bhāṣati lokanā_(96v3)yaka āśca]ryam̄ ida<m> satyam ananyathā ca 62*

SYMBOLS

()	restored <i>akṣara</i> (s)
[]	damaged <i>akṣara</i> (s)
< >	omitted (part of) <i>akṣara</i> (s) without gap in the MS.
{ }	superfluous <i>akṣara</i> (s) or a <i>dāṇḍa</i>
+	one lost <i>akṣara</i>
..	one illegible <i>akṣara</i>
.	illegible part of an <i>akṣara</i>
*	<i>virāma</i>
α ← β	the word form β should be changed to α

ABBREVIATIONS

BHSG = Franklin Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar*, New Haven, 1953: Yale University Press; Repr. Delhi, ²1970: Motilal Banarsi Dass.

BV = Gregory M. Bongard-Levin and M. I. Vorob'ëva-Desyatovskaja, "Novye sanskritskie teksty iz Tsentral'noj Azii," in: *Tsentral'naja Azija. Novye Pamjatniki Pis'mennosti i Iskusstva*, Moskva 1987, pp. 6-18; plates pp. 302-311.

KN = *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka*, ed. Hendrik Kern and Bunyiu Nanjio, St. Petersbourg 1908-12 : Académie Imperiale des Sciences (Bibliotheca Buddhica X); Reprint: Tokyo 1977: Meicho-Fukyū-Kai.

s.e. = scribal error

SI P = Central Asian fragments in the Petrovsky collection of St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences, with the siglum Ser India Petrovskij.

SP(O) = the so-called Kashgar manuscript of the *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra*, actually found in Khādaliq but purchased in Kashgar. Facsimile edition: *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra. Kashgar Manuscript*, edited by Lokesh Chandra with a foreword by Heinz Bechert, New Delhi 1976 (Śata-Piṭaka Series 229) [Repr. Tokyo, Reiyukai, 1977]; transliteration: Hirofumi Toda, *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra, Central Asian Manuscripts, Romanized Text*, Tokushima ¹1981, ²1983 : Kyoiku Shuppan Center, pp. 3-225.

⁷ *iha* : probably s.e. for *ima* = SP(O); cf. KN 92.1. *mama* = SI P/20.4(2) verso 4.

⁸ + + .. .o : probably (*lokana*্yak)o = KN 92.4, SI P/20.4(2) verso 5.

Wi = Klaus Wille, *Fragments of a Manuscript of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra from Khādaliq*, Tokyo 2000: Soka Gakkai (Lotus Sutra Manuscript Series 3).